

THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

NO. XLII....JULY, 1846.

ARTICLE I.

REMARKS ON THE SIXTEENTH PSALM.

An Article in the Biblical Repository. First Series. Vol. I., page 51. Andover.

THE difficulties which embarrass the interpretation of the Sixteenth Psalm are known and acknowledged. Scholars of the highest rank, at different times, and aided by each other's labors, have expended the treasures of their learning, and tasked all their skill to remove them. The result of these endeavors has been far from satisfactory. The difficulties remain in all their original force. The door of entrance into the mysteries of the Psalm is yet unopened. The true principle of interpretation has not yet been applied. We still ask, Who is the speaker in the Psalm? What is the meaning, and what the application of the terms employed? The closing verses seem to speak of a resurrection. Is it a proper or a figurative resurrection? If the former, whose resurrection is intended? No oracle has furnished a satisfactory response to these inquiries. The uses made of these verses by the apostles Peter and Paul, have, in the minds of many, even increased the embarrassment. A discrepancy is fancied between the explanation given

by them, and the evident meaning as indicated on the face of the Psalm. Hence a new difficulty is added. How shall this apparent difficulty be reconciled? To effect this, various and opposing theories have been contrived; some of them as remarkable for their impiety as for their ingenuity; and all equally and utterly unavailing.

Why then add another, which may seem as unsatisfactory as those which have gone before it? It may be suggested too, that matters so grave and confessedly perplexing should be left with the learned and practised in biblical criticism. The crudities of ordinary minds shed darkness, and not light, by their unbidden entrance on themes above their reach. While the present writer would not come forward as an instructor of the learned, he holds it to be the right and the duty of every one, however humble his pretensions, to give to the world whatever he deems useful and true, however great the presumption the publication may seem to imply.

The object of this essay is not to offer verbal criticism, nor practical remark on the general topics of meditation suggested in the Psalm; but rather to intimate the posture of the author's mind; to define the real object which glowed in the light of his inspired and prophetic vision; to trace the thread of thought, which runs through and distinguishes the Psalm.

The great difficulties sought to be removed, relate chiefly to the latter part of the Psalm—the resurrection indicated. To prepare the way, it is deemed proper to expose some of the more important explanations already before the world. These, though somewhat numerous, may be reduced to three leading ones. The reader may find a minute and critical examination of them in an able essay, written some years ago by Professor Stuart for the *Biblical Repository*, and quoted at the head of this article. The interpretation adopted and elaborately defended by the Professor, chiefly claims consideration; as, in this country, it is the one most extensively received. A brief reference to the others will suffice.

The first method of interpretation refers the entire Psalm to David. He is regarded as alike the speaker and the subject. The whole force of the language applies to him personally and alone; without conveying the most

distant allusion to any one else. All mystic interpretations are repudiated as abhorrent to enlightened reason. This interpretation supposes the author of the Psalm to be contemplating, prospectively, his own personal and literal resurrection from the dead; or, as is more commonly believed and insisted on by this class of writers, a figurative resurrection—a signal deliverance from imminent peril. It defers not in the least to the apostles, as inspired and infallible expositors. They, like all other finite mortals, may err. Passing by the immodesty of this interpretation, it is enough to say, it is wholly gratuitous. We will not affirm, that the mere language of the Psalm, apart from all other considerations, cannot, by any possible and legitimate construction, be understood to denote a metaphorical resurrection. All languages are familiar with such strong, figurative representations. They are frequent in the Bible. But Peter and Paul have unequivocally decided against it; and have assigned their reasons. The words in question, they assert, and even condescend to prove, apply exclusively to the proper and literal resurrection of Christ; not by way of accommodation, as receiving in that memorable event a fulfilment; but they expressly restrict the application to it, as the only and necessary accomplishment of the prophecy. The above mode of interpreting the Psalm cannot be entertained, therefore, without renouncing the authority of these inspired teachers. For this we are not prepared. We must, at least, first see some necessity for it.

The second method, and the one demanding special consideration, makes the entire Psalm the language of Christ. David wholly disappears. All the earnest expressions of steadfast piety and exulting hope are the real and ardent breathings of the Messiah. David is only the apparent, Christ is the real, though invisible speaker. The personal pronoun "I," occurring in the Psalm, belongs to Christ. The scene described, as the advocates of this theory suppose, is laid just before the cross. There the Redeemer, in full view of his bitter sorrows and violent death, sings, in the language here ascribed to him, his conflict and his victory. "This strikes me," says Prof. Stuart, "as the best and only sure interpretation." He proceeds to give his reasons for adhering to it. Two he presents in due form; the third, he mentions inciden-

tally. The first is the coincidence between this Psalm thus interpreted, and other parts of the prophetic writings. We are referred to the forty-third chapter of Isaiah. Here is said to be "a great resemblance." "The general course of thought is alike in both." "In some respects," the "great resemblance" urged may be allowed. They evidently both relate, in some way, to the Messiah; and the general sentiment may be alike in both. There is, however, one very material respect, in which they are widely dissimilar. They are not at all alike in their structure. Isaiah speaks of Christ in the third person. No one could suppose him to mean himself. David, in the sixteenth Psalm, uses the first person; and certainly seems to be speaking his own feelings. The mere correspondence in language and sentiment proves nothing to the purpose. It only shows that these might be uttered by the Messiah, which no one perhaps would dispute. Had Isaiah, like David, employed the first person, "I shall grow up before him," the comparison would be relevant, and the reference unexceptionable. The Professor seems to us to have overlooked the difference in the two passages. Christ does not speak through Isaiah, as he is supposed to speak through David.

The twenty-second and fortieth Psalms to which we are likewise referred, it is admitted, are more closely analogous in structure with the sixteenth Psalm. The first person is used throughout, and that the course of thought is the same, cannot be denied. But we have now before us a principle of interpretation. In a given passage, the apparent speaker is affirmed not to be the actual speaker; and the personal pronouns have an application assigned them, different from the obvious one. Unfortunately, these references do not verify the principle. In neither of these passages is it clear and admitted, that the language throughout is entirely that of Christ. That he applies parts of them to himself is conceded. That most, if not all of them, with a little aid of the imagination, might be so applied, need not be denied. This might be said of many other Psalms. It may be still further admitted that these Psalms all speak of Christ, and yet he not be the speaker throughout. The principle seems to us not to be supported by the references. Many of the Messianic portions of the Old Testament can be more

satisfactorily explained on other principles. This will be shown, in its place, in this essay.

His second argument is derived from the language of the Psalm itself. He "finds the exegesis more easy and natural, throughout, when interpreted in this way, than in any other." "There is most evidently but one person throughout the Psalm." "I can never doubt that from beginning to end, one and the same person speaks; and this person I believe to be the Messiah." The double sense he rejects; the idea of a change of person, he cannot allow; and he assumes that the language of the entire Psalm is more naturally applicable to Christ, than to David. This branch of the argument, the Professor dismisses almost without remark; presuming his position strong enough in itself. Others, however, have met with difficulties in making such an application of the entire Psalm. Let any one try it, and if he does not find "some things hard to be understood," his success will be most singular. The exegesis is, in our view, unnatural; and interpretations which seem to be forced can never be satisfactory. The mind feels in spite of itself, an instinctive consciousness of inconsistency. Truth and error make different, and respectively peculiar impressions. The former, dwelling in her own pavilion of light, covered with the transparent drapery of heaven, displays her full-wrought features, and her exquisite symmetry swelling on the eye, and crowding the imagination with images of beauty. Her power penetrates and enlivens the whole intellectual and moral being. The latter is unsightly, obscure, out of proportion, and unsatisfactory. A just explanation conveys instant and full conviction; an erroneous one only compels a reluctant assent. Try the foregoing interpretation by this test. The mind involuntarily rejects it.

The Professor's third, and, as he says, his main argument is, "The apostles Peter and Paul have so explained it, and done it in such a way, as does not seem to be compatible with any other mode of interpretation; unless we renounce all deference to the apostles as interpreters of the Scripture." If this statement be true, the question is beyond the province of debate. It is forever settled. The testimony of inspired men is unerring. To ascertain it, is the last step in the process of investigation. To doubt it

is to hurl the superstructure of truth and hope from its only solid and sufficient basis. But is it true that the apostles so interpreted the entire Psalm? This is a legitimate point of inquiry. And it is obvious to observe, in the first place, that they do not pretend to interpret the entire Psalm. Their remarks are confined to the closing verses. How could they then affirm Christ to be the speaker throughout? In the second place, they distinctly declare David to be the speaker, and not the Messiah, as the Professor affirms.

There are other objections to this mode of interpretation.

1. It is arbitrary. The writer is driven to it by a sort of felt necessity. Difficulties, pressing on every hand, seemed to point out this, as the only feasible alternative. Nothing on the face of the Psalm, nor any where else, indicates Jesus as the speaker. In making the application to Christ, no point in his history seemed so suitable to the scene supposed to be described, as "some period not long before his passion and death." This point is also taken arbitrarily. It is indicated by no hint in the Psalm, or in any other part of the sacred writings.

2. It is peculiar. The principle of hermeneutics it involves is not recognized, except in writings purely fabulous. "Books of riddles" are so explained. It surely has no parallel in the word of God. The Professor, we think, has failed to justify it by his references. Is an interpretation so peculiar, a safe one?

3. It involves the most objectionable feature of the double-sense method. The Professor rejects the double sense, because it is enigmatical. To the "occult meaning," the "mystic sense," he has earnest objections. Now let it be observed, that this "mystic sense," to which he objects, is the very sense he adopts. The obvious, historic sense is rejected. He accepts, it is true, but one meaning, but it is the concealed one. So we still need the "second revelation."

The Prof. has given a new translation of the Psalm, to make, as it would seem, the language of it more appropriate to Christ. In the common version, the second and third verses are thus rendered: "My goodness extendeth not to thee; but to the saints that are in the earth." This language would be very suitable to David, as expressing his unworthiness in respect to God; but how it

can apply to one who claimed an equality with God, is not easily seen. The goodness of Christ must, at least, include his righteousness as mediator. How can this be nothing with Jehovah? That the new version, by which the Professor seeks to avoid the difficulty, is not the most obvious and natural one is apparent from the very extended and elaborate justification with which he deems it necessary to justify it. Without following him through his circuit of minute criticism, we must be allowed to express our conviction, that while his zeal, and industry, and learning are worthy of all praise, his success in the present case, is exceedingly doubtful. It seems to us like the wresting of words from their common and designed office.

In the sixth verse, the author thus expresses himself: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage." This language implies circumstances of great delight, wholly incompatible with those in which Christ was placed. He was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" and, according to the view of the esteemed Professor, this Psalm describes him when overwhelmed with the prospect of his sufferings.

The third mode of interpreting the Psalm lies between these two; or rather is comprehensive of them both. The theory of a double sense, the one obvious and literal, the other hidden and allegorical, has always had numerous and firm friends. It even lays claim to inspired authority; and passages are gravely cited from the New Testament in confirmation of it. The terms employed by writers on the double sense are often so vague and general in their character, that it is not always easy to determine precisely what is intended. The words *sense*, *meaning*, and *application*, seem to be used as identical and interchangeable. If the precise ground occupied by each of these terms could be defined, it would contribute much towards the settlement of the controversy. While the double sense, strictly interpreted, is disallowed, it may be safely held that statements and facts in the old economy, and also in the new, have a "deeper meaning" and more important connections, than are indicated by the naked terms in which they are introduced. The progressive experience of successive generations, and especially the clearer light of Christianity, is constantly enriching the dark passages of the past dispensation. Many an arid waste has been

reclaimed by the fertilizing influence of higher and more perfect revelation; and where once nothing met the eye but sterility, now waves an ample harvest. Thus the "deeper meaning" and the true application of the sixteenth Psalm are developed by the comments of the apostles. The Christian sees in it what was hidden from the men of David's time. It must be conceded, too, that passages may have a twofold application, while the terms employed are taken only in one sense. The original curse and the original promise are evidently of this nature. But we are not about to enter upon a vindication of the double sense. Its aid is not needed in the present discussion. The following interpretation, it is believed, will be found in this respect unexceptionable.

We will regard David, who is the apparent speaker, as the actual speaker in the Psalm, and as speaking of himself. In this way we find no difficulty in tracing the course of thought till we reach the tenth verse. Up to this point, every sentiment and form of expression are not only suited to him, but seem to demand him as the subject. So far too there is no conflict with any other part of the Bible. Of this part of the Psalm, the apostles say nothing. The language is beautifully descriptive of feelings, attachments, and purposes proper to the devout frame of a truly pious man; just such a man as David is known to have been. The deep consciousness of dependence and of unworthiness; the pure, bright flame of devotion; the heartfelt gratitude; the instinctive abhorrence of idols, breathed through this portion of the Psalm, find parallels in many other Psalms, and are indicative of the inner spiritual life of the sweet harper of Israel. All the embarrassment in interpreting the Psalm in this way, is felt to arise from the remaining verses. Can these be so applied, without doing violence to the terms employed, or to the explanation of the apostles? If they can, all embarrassment vanishes. In pursuance of this explanation, we must speak somewhat more freely of the patriarch David. Who was he? What were his relative peculiarities? Did he fill such a place in the divine economy, and hold such relations to the Messiah, as to be, in any intelligible and unexceptionable sense, one with him, so that language spoken of himself has emphatic reference to Christ? Let us look narrowly into this point. David

was a king, raised to that high dignity by God's special designation. He was God's anointed. In him was established a royal line, spiritual, as well as temporal. To him, as God's representative, the earthly repository of divine authority, the world was to submit. "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost part of the earth for thy possession." The prosperity of his throne was guaranteed by oath. Christ was to spring from his line, in whom the promise was to receive its accomplishment. Hence all David's hopes centred in Christ. He was to live in him. His own death could not interrupt a succession so secured. Now let us bring this view of David to our aid in the elucidation of the sixteenth Psalm. The author is abstracted, as was his habit, in devout meditation. In recording the evidences of God's mindfulness of him, his peculiar spiritual position could not be long absent from his thoughts. His mind warms and expands with his theme. The covenant made with him, "ordered in all things and sure," kindles hope to its intensest glow. His visions of the future become so distinct, so full, so clear, as entirely to ravish and absorb his faculties. The long and illustrious line of kings, proceeding from himself and terminating in Christ, the greatest king of all his line; the government committed to him, to be continued in the hands of Christ, raised from the dead; and through him, to extend its sway over all nations and through all time, is the lofty theme to which his harp is strung. "I die, but 'my flesh shall rest in hope.' Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. My throne endures, for thou wilt raise up Christ to sit upon it. The path of life is before me. I live in Christ; and triumph over death." Thus David is the speaker throughout the Psalm, and is speaking of what concerned himself. In his capacity as God's anointed, he anticipated a real and a glorious resurrection. How far the mind of David recognized the great results to himself and the church, springing from the resurrection of the Messiah, may not be easily determined. Whether he associated with that event any idea of his own personal resurrection to eternal life, his language does not settle. Nor does the explanation of the apostles. It is certain,

however, that the spirit of prophecy which dwelt in him, directed his mind to a fact, in which the hopes of humanity are garnered. In all probability, David will derive a far richer inheritance of blessing from it than his hopes ever anticipated. What he saw darkly "as in a glass," we "see with open face."

In support of this view of the Psalm, the following considerations are submitted.

1. This leaves the Psalm entire, consistent, natural, and easy; with no breach upon its unity; and agreeing in the principles of its exegesis with all other writings, sacred and profane. All the personal pronouns are taken in their proper and apparent sense. No aid is evoked from darkness and mysticism. No unseen personage is forced upon the stage to relieve the pressure of difficulty. It is neither impious, irrational, nor arbitrary. The author speaks in strains suited to the circumstances in which he is placed. If he utters truths in advance of his times, it is because he is a prophet.

2. This is conceived to be the way in which the apostles, Peter and Paul, have interpreted the Psalm. Our own view could not well be better represented than in their language. The commentary of Peter is found in Acts 2: 25-31. It is strikingly clear and definite; and may be properly transcribed. "For David speaketh concerning him: I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is at my right hand that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad: moreover, also, my flesh shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance." Thus far is quotation from the Psalm in question. The commentary follows. "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David. He is dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." He is not risen in his own proper person. "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption." The above is

so plain, that comment would seem unnecessary. According to this apostle, David, not Christ, is the speaker in the sixteenth Psalm. He is giving utterance to hopes cherished by him, respecting the perpetuity of his dynasty. These hopes were founded on a special promise, confirmed by oath. "Of the fruit of his body according to the flesh, God would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." He would rest in hope. His prospects did not terminate in the grave. He would rise and reign in the person of the Messiah.

The remarks of Paul are brief, and but slightly affect the particular point in question. As far as they go, they coincide entirely with those of Peter. They both show that David is referring to the resurrection of Christ.

3. This view is confirmed by other quotations and statements found in the New Testament, respecting David and Christ. In Acts 13 : 22, 23, Paul quotes and comments thus : "I have found David, the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfil all my will. Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus." According to the promise made to David, God hath raised up Christ. This promise respected the perpetuity of his throne. The sixteenth Psalm records the meditation of David in regard to its fulfilment. In the 33rd verse of this 16th chapter of Acts, Paul cites a passage from the 2d Psalm. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." This is employed by the apostle in proof of Christ's resurrection. On what principle is it so employed? It was originally addressed to David, on the occasion of his inauguration. In itself, it certainly conveys no idea of a resurrection. In order to justify this application of the words, we must suppose a connection of some sort between the inauguration of David and the resurrection of Christ. In some way, the one must involve the other. The use the apostle Peter makes of the 16th Psalm indicates the connection, and makes out the proof. "Thou art my Son"—my Messiah; "this day have I begotten thee"—raised thee to the throne. This language is addressed to David, not merely as an individual; but as the head of a line. This again involves the necessity of Christ's resurrection from the dead. Hence the propriety of the quotation.

In the next verse, Paul quotes from Isaiah 55 : 3. "I

will give you the sure mercies of David." The purpose for which he uses the passage is indicated by the preceding part of the verse. "And as concerning that he raised him from the dead, no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise." Now what are these "sure mercies of David?" and on what principle of exegesis do they include the resurrection of Jesus? The proper answers to these questions cannot be very difficult. "The sure mercies of David" are the stipulations of the covenant made with him; and which was "ordered in all things and sure." This covenant stipulated that "of the fruit of his loins, God would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." Hence "the sure mercies of David" include the resurrection of Christ. The quotation of the apostle is therefore legitimate. The sixteenth Psalm is the record of David's meditations on these "sure mercies." He regarded them in the same light with Paul. He should live in the person of Christ, who would be raised up "to sit on his throne."

4. The subject should be further considered in connection with the peculiar spiritual position assigned to David—his relation to the Messiah's reign. The current language of the Bible respecting him is remarkable.

The entire Jewish economy has preëminently a spiritual meaning. Its ritual embodies great religious ideas. It was an early stage in the progress of a development, to be completed in the perfection of heaven. Infant truth was cradled in mystery. In this economy, David holds a high place. He was, in God's stead, the king of Israel. With him, as the first of his line and its representative, and especially as the representative of Christ, for whose sake the line was established and the promises made, was deposited the divine authority—the first conception of a spiritual life. Hence David and Christ are so often identified. And this identity extends to their governments. The transition from David to Christ is very frequent. This will not fail to throw light on many passages of the Old Testament, which otherwise cannot be satisfactorily explained. We select for illustration the 130th Psalm, beginning with the 11th verse, for the very obvious reason that it contains the promise which so exalted the hopes of David; and especially raised his thoughts to the contemplations recorded in the sixteenth Psalm. "The Lord hath sworn in truth

unto David; he will not turn from it. Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant and my testimony that I shall give them, their children also shall sit upon thy throne forevermore. For the Lord hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever. Here will I dwell, for I have desired it. I will abundantly bless her provision; I will satisfy her poor with bread. I will also clothe her priests with salvation; and her saints shall shout aloud for joy. There will I make the horn of David to bud. I have ordained a lamp for mine anointed. His enemies will I clothe with shame; but upon himself shall his crown flourish." This passage clearly develops David's relation to a spiritual kingdom. As the mere temporal king of Israel, it will not apply to him. Considered in his higher relations to a kingdom not of this world—a sort of forerunner and anticipation of the Messiah, it applies to him with great force and beauty. His kingdom is seen to run on and expand into that of Christ. Their dominion is one. They occupy the same throne. They hold the same sceptre. They both reign in Zion—the one Zion, reaching through all ages.

A large portion of the prophetic writings is evidently to be interpreted in this way. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots." The prophet goes on to describe a scene of moral beauty, true only in its application to the most perfect stage of Messiah's reign. But the "rod comes forth out of the stem of Jesse." The seed of this rich moral harvest is sown in David; it flourishes in David's greater son. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder. His name shall be called wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end; upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. Christ sits on David's throne; and David lives still in Christ. Jeremiah speaks in the same lofty strain. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch; and a king shall reign and prosper; and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In

his days shall Judah be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called, 'The Lord our Righteousness.'" Other passages of equal pertinence with the above might be cited, showing the peculiar relation of David to the kingdom of Christ, and of God; but these are deemed sufficient. Now if this relationship really exists, it may and must be admitted as a principle of interpretation. Apply it to the sixteenth Psalm, and the mystery in which that portion of God's word has been heretofore wrapped, at once disappears. That the apostles do so apply it, has been fully shown. David, as a prophet, foresaw that God would "raise up Christ to sit on his throne." "Seeing this, he spake of the resurrection of Christ."

The same principle may be applied to other Psalms and portions of the Old Testament, which relate to the Messiah. This essay is already too far extended to allow the application to be made here. Nor is it necessary. The principle being once evolved, and successfully applied in a given case, will sufficiently illustrate the manner of its application in all other cases. It is confidently believed that this principle has extensive application in the interpretation of the past economy; and when judiciously employed, will render many dark places of the sacred writings plain. It may be objected, that it favors the double sense theory. But in our view it is the only way of avoiding the necessity of that theory.

Whatever may be thought of some particular discussions in the foregoing essay, the main point—the closing verses of the Psalm—can hardly be gainsayed. The difficulties which have embarrassed the interpretation of this portion of God's word, it must be allowed, are removed without doing violence to the language of the Psalm, or the teachings of Peter and Paul.

E. W. D.

ARTICLE II.

The New Testament in Karen. By FRANCIS MASON.
Baptist Mission Press. Tavoy. 1843.

Karen Grammar. By FRANCIS MASON. MS.

By REV. F. MASON, TAVOY.

THE Karen Grammar, if printed in its present state, would make a large volume. It is in four parts. 1. Etymology, containing seventy pages. This part is intended to show the formation of words, and to exhibit all the particles in the order of the parts of speech, except the adverbs, which are so numerous, that, for a Grammar, a selection only was deemed most appropriate. The selection, however, contains more than six hundred words, embracing more than three hundred and fifty pairs of roots imitative of sounds. 2. Syntax, about the same size as the etymology. 3. Figures of speech and prosody, containing all the examples of figures that I have met with, or, at least, noticed. It is about half the size of the preceding. 4. A vocabulary of the principal particles, with numerous examples of their various uses, occupying between four and five hundred pages. This is by far the most valuable part of the work, containing, as I estimate it does, thousands of examples of the manner in which the natives use the prefixes and affixes, in the right use of which the whole art of the language consists; a collection which it would have been laborious to make in a written language, but much more so in an unwritten one. I have been making the collection ever since I commenced the study of the language. I always travel among the people with paper and pencil in my pocket, and every expression that I hear, adapted in any way to illustrate the language, I secure on the spot. Again, I have had every assistant that has been about me at different times, write down all the traditions, poetry, and stories that he knew; and in this way I have collected some two or

three hundred articles, besides thirty or forty collected by other members of the mission. This does not include a collection of letters and written exhortations that I also made, but finally threw aside, as being often written by persons unused to original composition. I found them of less value, and unsuited to my purpose. Furthermore, my assistant San Qua-la is now so well trained, that he has been able to write me down sentences in common use, adapted to illustrate the manner in which words and particles are used. These are the sources whence the examples in my Grammar are derived; and whatever errors I may make in defining and explaining the different shades of meaning, which, from the examples, I infer the particles to have, the examples themselves will always be valuable, and by them I afford the means for others to correct my own mistakes; for I am far from flattering myself that I always take the true conception of the character of a particle. Many of them are as difficult to define as $\tau\acute{\iota}$ or $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ in Greek; and those best acquainted with the language differ as much in the views they take of some of them, as Greek scholars do in relation to the force of the tenses in the derived moods. I ought to add that most of the examples remain as yet untranslated; and that, because it would occupy much of my time to no useful purpose; for the brethren that have taken copies understand the Karen as well as they would our English version. To give some idea of the work, I will extract a few articles.

FROM THE SYNTAX.

Tense.—Use of the Aorist.

“The simplest form of the verb, here denominated *Aorist*, denotes the existence of an action in the most indefinite manner. It may be finished or unfinished, present or past. Time does not appear to enter into its elements; but from the nature of the case, to exist it must be connected with the present or the past. Hence,

1. It sometimes denotes the present tense.
2. It is often equivalent to the English imperfect tense; embracing both the Greek imperfect and aorist in part.
3. It is used where the perfect tense is sometimes used in English; but such instances are usually susceptible of being rendered by the imperfect.
4. It is used by the prophets for the future tense; the event being represented as present or past.

5. When followed by *dau*, and, and a verb in the future tense, it is also used for the future.

Use of the Perfect Tense.

The perfect tense in the active voice denotes an action completed.

1. When used absolutely, the action is represented as 'completed in reference to the present time.'

2. 'When the particular time of any occurrence is specified,' this tense is frequently used, where in English 'the imperfect is necessary.' When used, it indicates the completion of the action in reference to that time; but when the aorist is used, as in such instances it may be, there is usually an incompleteness implied.

3. When the act was completed before some past event mentioned, it is used to express the English pluperfect tense.

4. When the act would have been completed but for something intervening to prevent, it is used for the pluperfect tense of the potential mood—should, would have.

5. With passive and neuter verbs, it is ambiguous. The act may or may not be completed; and hence admits of being rendered variously. Qualifying words are used, when it is deemed important to be definite.

Use of the Future Tense.

1. 'It designates an action to take place at any future period indefinite.'

2. It sometimes denotes that the act is about to take place; as, The king about to die (lit. will die) said to his wife.

3. It is sometimes used for the imperfect tense of the potential mood—should, or would; as, Were it not for the teacher, I would go (lit. I will go) to Mata.

4. Sometimes it is used for the pluperfect tense of the potential mood—should, or would have; as, Because the Python would have devoured (lit. will devour) thee, I slew him.

Sometimes the same act may be expressed either by the perfect [4] or the future [4], but the expressions differ, as, in English, 'I had died but for thee,' differs from, 'I should have died but for thee.'

5. Analogous to the formation of the paulo-post future in Greek, it is used with the characteristic of the perfect tense to express the English second-future tense.

POTENTIAL MOOD.

Ability.

There are several specific words for the English generic term, can.

Thē, in general, is used with the negative of such an inability as is supposed to be beyond the control of the subject at the time, but which labor and skill may overcome; but it is also frequently applied where the instrument of action is wanting, and thus embraces cases that involve natural impossibilities.

Kai, in general terms, is ability, moral or physical, in the subject supposed to be in the possession of all the faculties necessary for the

action, but which may be so diseased as to render the performance naturally impossible. Hence it is applied in reference to sickness and bodily weakness from any cause, but not where a limb or member of the body is wanting with which the act is performed. It is also used with the negative of the inability that arises from indolence, reluctance to endure that which is painful or unpleasant, and of unwillingness.

Nē has reference to the ability of obtaining or attaining to an object. In other words, it denotes ability to overcome the obstacles that are offered by the object. *Kai* contemplates the subject, *nē* the object. It is applied to lifting and carrying things that are heavy, to crossing streams with a strong current, to inducing indolent or unwilling people to action; and the like.

Pghai contemplates the object also, but does it with direct reference to its quantity.

Khlu contemplates the object as reaching unto it at a distance.

There are some other words of more specific application, that are used where we would sometimes use 'can,' in English; as *tu*, with verbs of motion, but the above are the principal ones.

In some cases, either of two or more of the above particles may be used with equal propriety; not that their significations coincide, as is sometimes supposed, but because two or more different conceptions may be taken of the subject. Thus, of a load, when I contemplate my own feelings, I use *kai*; but when I look at the weight of the object, I use *nē*. So when unable to cross a rapid stream, according to the difference of conception, *kai*, *nē*, or *thē* may be used."

It may be seen from the last extract how necessary it is for a translator to be able rightly to interpret the Scriptures, and to be sound in the faith. A translator must be an interpreter; he cannot avoid it. Wherever *Ávraμai* occurs, I must determine its precise signification before I can render it correctly, and that is often no easy task. Neither is it easy to catch the true character of the Karen particles above. I have heard one brother say, if I recollect right, that *kai* designates natural ability, and *thē*, moral; while a short time ago I heard another contend for the precisely opposite view, that *kai* denoted moral, and *thē*, natural ability. Both had come to their conclusions after studying the language for years, independently of each other; and both, I am persuaded, were wrong in their general conclusions, though both were right in part; each word being used occasionally in both significations. We often err by trying to make the words and idioms of these eastern languages fit exactly to our occidental tongues. We see the real resemblance of a part, and then infer the resemblance of the whole. The truth is, the languages are run in different moulds; and though there are partial correspondences, they can only be learned to any purpose

by a patient study of all their parts; or by taking the results of those who have so studied them. The *usus loquendi* is paramount to all other considerations with me; and the views given above are founded on the usage I find in the seven or eight pages of examples that I furnish to illustrate their signification.

[Mr. Mason's manuscript furnishes several additional pages, illustrating the use of particles; but, though useful to a Karen missionary, they would furnish little that could be intelligible or instructive to a curious English scholar. The remainder of this article contains Mr. Mason's observations in respect to his translation of the New Testament into the Karen language. They are well adapted to show the difficulty of the work, and the importance of sending forth to the heathen men of the highest critical ability and learning. The same difficulties, substantially, which have been found by Mr. Mason, must recur in the rendering of the Scriptures into all other heathen languages.—ED.]

The translator of the Karen New Testament commenced his work with the two following canons. 1. A translation must give the ideas of the original. 2. A translation should be a picture of the original.

Two rules more just and comprehensive could not perhaps be adopted; but to follow them has been more difficult than the return of Æneas from Avernus.

“As one who, in thickets and in brakes
Entangled, winds now this way and now that
His devious course, uncertain, seeking home :
—Or lost in miry ways,
And sore discomfited from slough to slough
Plunging, and half despairing of escape.”

The sources of some of his difficulties, and his mode of disposing of them, shall be mentioned.

1. The same tropical expressions in different languages, sometimes express different ideas. Thus, “a great mind,” in English, denotes magnanimity; but in Karen, anger. “Nose of a mountain,” in Arabic, is a peak, or summit; but in Karen, a promontory or cape. To “eat against a city,” in Hebrew, is to make war upon it; but to “eat a city,” in Karen, is to possess it, and enjoy its revenues. In instances of this character, the figure has been sacrificed to preserve the idea.

2. The same idea is sometimes expressed, in different languages, by different tropes or idioms. Thus, "the head of the street," in Hebrew, denotes what is expressed in Karen by "the foot of the street." So, "a tongue of fire," in Hebrew, is "a leaf of fire," in Karen; "face of the earth," in Greek and English, is "back of the earth," in Karen; "eye of a needle," in English, is "tail of a needle," in Karen; "throw stones to a hair," in Hebrew, is "throw there, hit there," in Karen; "a head land," in English, is a "nose land," in Karen; "mouth of a trumpet," in English, is "head of a trumpet," in Karen; "to go before the wind," in English, is "to go after the wind," in Karen; "white for the harvest," in Greek, is "red for the harvest," in Karen; and "sown upon the earth," in Greek, is "sown in the earth," in English, but "sown under the earth," in Karen. Whenever such instances occur, the figure of the original has been changed for that of the vernacular.

3. Some ideas expressed figuratively or tropically in one language, are constantly expressed literally in another. The writer has disposed of such cases in two different ways. *a.* If the figure or trope, though not used in Karen, does not, when literally rendered, convey a wrong idea, it has been retained, and a literal rendering adopted. This course has been followed with such expressions as "see death," "fruit of repentance," "clothed with humility," "put on Christ," "loosed the pains of death," "opened their treasures," and many others. A similar course has been pursued, where the metaphor involves an allusion to some ancient custom; for although such passages are utterly inexplicable to a Karen reader, without the living teacher, yet to make them plain, would be to make a paraphrase, and not a translation. Matt. 16: 18, offers an example,—*"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."* *b.* If the figure, when transferred, would convey a wrong idea, it has been dropped, and the idea given in literal language. For example, Matt. 3: 12. *"He will thoroughly purge his floor."* Here the container is put by metonymy for the contained, the floor for the grain on the floor; and if rendered literally, a Karen would understand the cleansing of a floor, and not the cleansing of the grain on the floor, as intended by the sacred writer. In this instance, then, the language is

stripped of its drapery, and the idea given without a figure. The metonymy in the expression, "He hath made him to be sin for us," is treated in a like manner. So also, where the world is put for its inhabitants, the writer for what he writes, the thing sold for the price at which it is sold, and many other similar instances. Occasionally, where the contained is put for the container, a similar course has been pursued. For example, "golden incense," in Rev. 8: 3, is rendered "a golden vessel." The phrase "alpha and omega," is rendered as in the Hebrew version, by the first and last letters of the vernacular.

4. Very few words in one language correspond, in all respects, to the words of another; even in their literal significations. They are used either more generically, or more specifically in one language than in another. Thus, there is no word in Karen with which to render the verb 'strike,' in the same generic manner, that it is used in English. In Karen there are several verbs of striking, but they are more specific in their applications, varying, usually, with the instrument used. Thus, if the blow be given by a stick lengthwise, the word used is *tau*; if with the end of the same, it is *to*; if a horizontal blow be given with the fist, *hto* is the proper word; but a vertical blow with the same instrument is *thau*; while a blow with the open hand is *dai*. To strike a gong is *do*; and to strike together cymbals is *hte*. The Greek verb 'to be,' must be rendered four different ways in Karen; and 'to do good,' in two. On the other hand, three or four Greek words, signifying to do, have to be usually rendered in Karen by one word, the generic term, in this instance, being in Karen, and the specific ones in Greek. This difference, in the generic character of words, makes it necessary, sometimes, where several nouns are related to the same verb, either as direct or indirect complement, to use two verbs in the version where there is only one in the original; or to use one that, in the vernacular, is properly applicable to a part only of the nouns that follow. The first course has been followed in Matt. 10: 9, 10, where "Provide—in your purses," is rendered by one verb; and "Provide—for your journey," by another; both more specific than the one in the original. Our English translators have made one verb apply, by varying the rendering of

the same Greek preposition. The second course has been followed in Matt. 10: 34, where in Karen the verb is applicable, properly, only to the sword. Neither course is quite satisfactory.

5. For the words and expressions adverted to above, something equivalent, in a given instance, may be usually found; but there is a large class of words for which equivalent ones do not exist.

“Of this kind, says Campbell, if properly attended to, will be found most of the terms relating to morals, to the passions and matters of sentiment, or to the objects of the reflex and internal senses, in regard to which, it is often impossible to find words in one language that are exactly equivalent to those of another. . . . Herein consists one principal difficulty which translators, if persons of penetration, have to encounter. Finding it impossible to render fully the sense of their author, they are constrained to do the best they can by approximation.”

Here is a difficulty, which has to be met and overcome, on almost every page of the Bible. Sometimes the writer has used old words in new significations, sometimes he has formed new compounds, and sometimes he has resorted to circumlocution. In every passage in which such words occur, more or less obscurity necessarily rests upon the version. In other cases, he is sometimes satisfied with his renderings; in this, never. So far as practicable, he has consulted with his brethren in respect to some of the more important words; and to illustrate the difficulty by an example, a sketch of the correspondence on a single word shall be here transcribed. The writer formed originally for the word ‘conscience,’ a compound, signifying, “the mind that shows, or teaches, the difference between good and evil;” grounding it on Wayland’s definition, that “conscience is that faculty of the mind by which we distinguish between right and wrong in actions.” To this, one of the brethren objected, “This is not a very accurate definition of conscience. It would be better to say, ‘that faculty of the mind by which we distinguish between right and wrong in our actions.’” The same brother proposed, as exact a rendering of the Greek word, according to its etymology, as the Karen language is capable of. The writer objected that that compound signified consciousness, and not conscience; and that “to adopt consciousness for conscience, because such is the

etymology of the word, is like rendering tragedy by 'a song of a goat,' such being the etymology of that word. A third brother rejected both renderings and proposed another, which met with no favor from either party. Finally, consciousness, or more literally, "the mind that knows of itself," was adopted; and is used for conscience throughout this version. "The prevailing phrase in the Burman version" for the word, "signifies the mind which knows itself."

6. The differences in the grammars of different languages is another source of difficulty. A few shall be noticed. *a.* In the simple matter of the number of nouns, there is no little difference in usage. Karen nouns without an affix are of the common number, like the English words deer, sheep, swine, fish, and some others; and when a definite singular or plural is required, a particle is affixed; but in all general propositions, the noun without the affix is used. In Greek, "a noun singular with the article is frequently used as a collective of the whole class of things or persons to which it refers. The plural is often used where the predicate relates to only one subject, although the writer designs to express the thought in a general way. Some nouns which express a singular idea, are found uniformly in the plural. In cases without number, the singular number of nouns and pronouns stands generically for a whole class. *Vice versa*, the plural form is often used, where only an individual or particular thing is meant. Where the thought is designed to be general only, the plural is not unfrequently used." In all such cases the noun without an affix has been deemed the proper rendering. *b.* Some of the Greek pronouns differ considerably in their usage from the corresponding ones in Karen, but we have no space for examples. When the noun to which a third personal pronoun refers is distant, and would probably be referred in Karen to a nearer noun that intervenes, it has been deemed necessary to change the pronoun to its noun. In like manner, whenever the relative, with rare exceptions, is separated from its antecedent by intervening clauses, the noun has to be written in Karen instead of the pronoun. *c.* The tenses differ materially. For instance, in Greek, "the future tense expresses not simply the pure future, i. e. not merely that a thing will be done, happen, etc., but also

that it must or can be done." This use of the future being foreign to the Karen language, in such instances the rendering is made according to the signification. In Hebrew, the future tense is used sometimes for the imperative mood, "the place of which it always supplies in negative commands or prohibitions." Where such instances, from the Hebrew, occur in the New Testament, the imperative is used in the version. *d.* The passive voice is expressed differently. "The passive, from its nature, takes as its subject in the nominative, that which in the active stood as immediate object in the accusative. The subject or nominative of the accusative, on the contrary, becomes now the object, from, by, or through which I suffer or am affected. The passive form may then be resolved into the active, and the same idea preserved. Thus, "Achilles killed Hector," conveys precisely the same idea as "Hector is killed by Achilles." So καλὸς λέλεκται σοι may be rendered either, "it has been well said by thee," or "thou hast well said." The Karen has not always the same choice of forms that the Greek has; and hence an idea that is expressed in the passive voice in Greek, is often expressed by the active in Karen; so that to translate idiomatically, the one has sometimes to be rendered by the other. *e.* The collocation of words, in different languages, often differs so much, as to occasion difficulties, neither few nor small, in translating. For example, verbal clauses, preceded by a particle in the signification of 'because,' 'by,' 'though,' are required, by the idiom of the Karen language, to be placed before the principal verb on which the clause depends; and in sentences that are not much involved, in languages where they follow, they may be very adequately rendered. It often happens, however, that the dependent clause is followed by others dependent upon that; and as the whole, in such instances, must be kept together, it is sometimes found impracticable to place the clause in question in the position that the idiom of the language requires. For instance, in Luke 1: 77, a particle is required, in translating, before the clause τοῦ δοῦναι—αὐτοῦ. This is clear from a glance at the versions. In Tyndale's translation, and also in the Geneva version, 'and' is supplied; in the French version, *et pour*; but critics are agreed that the particle διὰ is the word implied in the original. Now, if

the sentence ended with this clause, it might be easily rendered; but all the clauses that follow, down to the close of the 79th verse, are so connected with it and with each other, that they cannot be separated; and to put the whole at the commencement of the sentence is out of the question. It is therefore left in the place where it is construed in Greek, and introduced with a particle much more generic in its signification than *διὰ*, making only an approximation to what is believed to be the sentiment of the original.

7. Perhaps in all versions, but especially in those made into the modern languages, the difference of idiom and construction make it necessary sometimes to supply words which are not in the original. In most versions, these words are distinguished in some way, as in the Hebrew version by hollow type, and in the French and English, by italics; but in many others they form a component part of the text. The general principle of the necessity of supplying such words is admitted; but the application of the principle is full of perplexity, as is apparent from the published versions where the words are marked. How strange soever it may appear to the general reader, it is not always clear, when a word is necessary in the translation, whether it should be regarded as in the original or not. Thus, Rom. 7: 8, 'manner of,' is not marked in the English version, while in the French, where the rendering is the same, the corresponding words are put in italics. So Rom. 1: 32, 'them' is marked in the French, but not in the English version; and in 9: 25, 'were' and 'was' are marked as supplied in the French, but not in the English. When the versions are agreed in supplying a word, they are often by no means united in the word to be supplied. Thus in Romans 8: 6, in the English version, the verb 'to be' is twice supplied, unmarked, by the way; while in the French, 'give' and 'produce' are severally supplied in italics. In Col. 1: 1, we have 'my' supplied in the Hebrew version, but 'our,' in the French and English; while in 4: 9, 'country' is supplied in French, but 'one' in English; and in 4: 16, 'which is sent' in the French version, is 'epistle' in the English. These variations may be illustrated by transcribing a single verse, Rom. 3: 29, from four different versions. The English, French, Hebrew, and Bur-

man. The words in italics, are the words marked as supplied by the translators.

English.—“*Is he* the God of the Jews only? *Is he* not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also.”

French.—“*God, is he* the God of the Jews only? *Is he* not so of the Gentiles also? Yes, *he is so* of the Gentiles also.”

Hebrew.—[Is] he the God of the Jews only, and not the *God* of the Gentiles? Yes, the *God* of the Gentiles also.”

Burman.—“*God, is he* the God of the Jews only? *Is he* not the God of the Gentiles also? Yes, *he is* the God of the Gentiles also.”

The Karen version, it may be added, to gratify the curiosity of the reader, is precisely like the Burman, excepting that the word ‘God’ is marked three times, the first, third, and fourth, in order, as supplied by the translators.

When a clause is rendered by an idiomatic expression, though the words do not correspond, the practice of translators seems to be uniform not to mark them. Thus *μη γένοιτο*, so often used by Paul, is rendered in the English version, “God forbid;” in the French, “*Dieu nous en garde* ;” in the Hebrew, “הִלְיָהוּ ;” where there is not a single word answering to the original in any of the versions, and yet no word is marked as supplied, because the whole conveys the idea of the original, in the peculiar idiom of each language.

There appears to be but little uniformity in the versions, as to the necessity for supplying a word. Thus in Rom. 11 : 4, the word ‘image’ is supplied in the English version, but nothing correspondent is found in either the French, Hebrew, or Burman versions; and on the other hand in 11 : 25, in the French version, “the church” is added at the close of the verse, for which nothing is found in the other versions. Similar instances might be produced, almost without number. The consequence of this difference of judgment among translators, is a great disparity in the versions as to the number of places in which words are supplied. A comparison of a portion of the French and English versions, showed that there are three times more words supplied in the French than in the English. In respect to the present translation, whatever is idiomatic, with the uniform practice of translators, is left undistinguished; but words supplied, except the verb ‘to be,’ are in scratched letter.

8. There is some difficulty in settling upon the recension of the New Testament to be followed. When Dr. Carey came to India, the labors of Griesbach were little known in England, and the character of his recension not established; so it would appear that he followed the *textus receptus* in his versions; for some of his English critics were profuse in their abuse of him and the Baptists, for their ignorance in not following Griesbach. Twenty or thirty years ago, when Judson and others came out to India, Griesbach was in his glory, and hence these translators followed Griesbach in their translations. For some years past, however, Griesbach has been going down on the ebb tide of popular favor; and hence these translators have come in for quite as much abuse as Dr. Carey—he, for not following Griesbach; they, for following him. When the writer came on the stage, Knapp was lord of the ascendant; so, like his predecessors, he went with the throng and followed Knapp, inserting doubtful passages in brackets, as he does. This course did not prove quite satisfactory to his brethren; so he next examined the evidence for each questionable passage from the character of the manuscripts in which they were found. Some, however, preferred having all in, which is found in the English version; and the writer has so far complied with their wishes, as to insert in brackets every doubtful word or clause, that has been brought to his notice. Every thing, or nearly so, therefore, that is in the English version, is in the Karen; but never having used a copy of the *textus receptus*, this cannot be affirmed as certain. Knapp, Vater, Bloomfield, and Scholz, have occupied the translator's table; and it is confidently believed that no idea is omitted, which is contained in any of those editions.

9. One other difficulty only shall be mentioned. There are no Lexicons, or Grammars, in Karen, to which appeal can be made, to decide questions in respect to the usage of language. In English, it is only necessary to quote Johnson, or Webster, or Murray, and the question is settled, and there is no further argument. Not so in Karen. For example, when the writer commenced writing the language, he found a difficulty in ascertaining what word the Karens used for 'spirit.' Not being able to settle upon any one, he adopted for immediate use the

word used in Burman, which is derived from the Pali. Subsequently, being joined by an associate, he adopted after mutual consultation the word *ka-la*. Further acquaintance with the language, however, convinced him that this was the wrong word; and that spirit, in Karen, was designated by *tha*, the word for 'heart.' Of course, *ka-la* was in turn reformed out of his writings, and *tha* reformed in. When it appeared, as it did, that this measure had not the unanimous approbation of his brethren, he collected and circulated all the examples of the use of *ka-la* that he had ever found in the Karen writings, or had heard in conversation; requesting the brethren to add to the list, for his information, if they had ever heard the word used differently. One of the brethren at another station wrote in reply, "*Ka-la* is a fabulous monster; and though we had no other word for soul, this would never do. As to the comparative claims of *tha* and *ka-la*, it seems to me preposterous to think of discussing the subject for a moment. You, however, have gone into it at length, and have thus given me a higher idea of your patience than you could have done in any other way. I am a little surprised, after having expended such an amount of labor, and gone, as you have, to the very bottom of the subject, that you should think of asking your brethren to add any thing for your 'information.' Have you not exhausted the subject? Whether you have or not, you have undoubtedly settled it, and that is enough." Yet notwithstanding this strong testimony against it, the use of *ka-la* is still advocated, and written in works prepared for the press. Now a good dictionary, containing not merely the English definitions, but also examples of the uses of the words in the significations attributed to them, would contribute more than any thing else to settle such questions, and their name is legion, because the words must be used in the manner there exhibited, as used by the natives, or it will devolve on an objector to produce examples of a different usage. Such a dictionary, the writer has much pleasure to be able to add, is now in preparation, and the printing commenced, by Mr. Wade; and if he lives to finish the work on the plan he has commenced, little more will be left to be desired in the department of Karen lexicography.

In consequence of these various difficulties, missionaries

must necessarily differ in opinion, in respect to the rendering of different passages in Scripture. Still, our differences are, in a great measure, the result of different courses of mental training, or different degrees of knowledge of the originals, or of different degrees of acquaintance with the vernaculars. Had each of us had the same education, in the largest sense of the word, and possessed equal degrees of knowledge, our views would be the same; for we feel alike. Our little differences are to be done away, not by a moral change, that is unnecessary; not by a long process of mental reasoning, perhaps difficult to comprehend, but by the mere sight of truth. At present, we see her through a foggy atmosphere and afar off, and our different positions offer different advantages and disadvantages. If B stood where A does, there is not a doubt but he would represent her just as A does, how much soever they may differ at present. Many words and things, now, fare with us as the bat does with the naturalists. One says it is a mouse, as is manifest from its general appearance. No, says another, it is a bird, as is plain from its wings. You are both wrong, says a third, it is a monkey, as is incontrovertible from its teeth; while all describe the bat precisely alike.

The two Epistles to the Corinthians were translated by Mr. Wade, the two to Timothy by Mr. Abbott, while Hebrews, Peter, Jude, and the two last Epistles of John were translated by Mr. Vinton. It might be inferred from the difference of opinion to which allusion has been made, that the translation as a whole would be an incongruous mass, some adopting one word for a given term and some another; some adopting one principle in rendering figures, tropes and idioms, and some another. And so it would be, if each one thought it indispensably necessary to carry out his opinions in practice in all their minutiae; but "*Omnia vincit amor.*" There is no difficulty, however knotty and inextricable, that does not melt away before it. The writer's rule has ever been to conform his translations, even where he thought them correct, to the views of his brethren in every case of but small importance; always regarding a first version as an evanescent production, that must necessarily be subjected to many changes hereafter, when many of these little matters will, through the influx of more light, be settled without controversy.

This simple rule has enabled him to adopt nine tenths of the criticisms offered him, without argument. His brethren, on the other hand, have gone beyond him, and the only fault he has ever felt disposed to charge them with, has been the adopting of his suggestions, as he feared, without sufficient examination.

The preceding remarks have been written to draw more attention to the science of translating than has been hitherto given, or the subject demands. It is passed over, in the usual course of study, with so meagre a notice, that when the missionary finds himself providentially thrown into the work, he has to form his own rules, as best he may, or go on without rules. And, for some reason or other, of the century of versions that have been made in the East, it is not known whether any two are formed on the same principles.

If the principles adopted by the writer are incorrect, he wishes to be shown his errors that he may correct them; and in the event of another edition, should the course he has taken, as explained in the preceding remarks, be approved, he proposes going more fully into the subject, for the sake of eliciting more light. None can be more desirous of giving "the mind of the Spirit," in the translations he makes, than he is; and few who have undertaken the work can have less confidence in their qualifications for it.

A translator is compelled, at every step of his work, to interpret his author, before he can attempt to translate him correctly; so that how startling soever the fact, it is none the less true, every version of the Scriptures is defiled and obscured with a portion of the prejudices and darkness of the instrument that makes it. Yet the importance of a correct translation can hardly be overrated. A single error may be fraught with incalculable evil. The writer was much struck with this thought, on noticing the triumphant tone with which one of Jerome's bad renderings was quoted, in the "*Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*." "At the moment of the approach of Lent," says a notice, "when Christians are called to grave thoughts, the Archbishop of Sens reëchoes from his high evangelical seat, this proclamation of Daniel, '*Peccata tua eleemosynis redime*.'" Dan. 4: 27. To giving such passages in the language of the people, there appears to be no objection;

for it is immediately added, "*Rachetez vos peches par vos aumônes.*" Redeem your sins with your alms.

Some find, to their astonishment, in reading the Scriptures in the languages of India, that the words of inspiration are robbed of half their glory; and they feel disposed to charge the unfortunate translators with something like sacrilege. If such could transport themselves to Corinth or Ephesus in the days of Paul, they would perhaps be still more astonished, to find that the words of some of the originals had no more hallowed associations to the Greeks, to whom they were addressed, than the words of the Indian versions have to Indian readers. The word for 'God' was hung around with as many polluting associations, to the mind of a Corinthian, or an Ephesian, as it now is to a Hindoo. The church was any kind of an assembly, from a conference of the gods down to a mob in the streets of Ephesus; and glory had no more of a halo around it, than our English word reputation. The theological uses of flesh and spirit, light and darkness, grace and truth, and fifty other words, the Greek had to learn after he had obtained the ideas they represent, just as a Burman or a Karen has now.

The translation of this precious volume has cost the writer the labors of a large portion of the best ten years of his life. Those who have not the language to grope out word by word, as he has had to do, will doubtless be surprised that he has done no better in so long a time. Many words and constructions, for which his successors will have to turn only to the pages of a dictionary or a grammar, have literally cost him weeks of labor. Few are the words in his version, be they right or wrong, on which he could not inscribe with truth the motto that one of the first voyagers to Greenland carved on his oar—

"Oft was I weary when I toil'd at thee."

ARTICLE III.

ON REBAPTISM.

Hinton's History of Baptism. Philadelphia. 1840.

Ripley's Examination of Stuart on Baptism. Boston. 1833.

Pengilly's Guide to Baptism. Philadelphia. 1840.

It is singular that after all the works that have been published on baptism, no chapter has been devoted in any one of them, to our knowledge, laying down, beyond the mode and the subject, fixed principles to determine when a baptism is valid or when to be repeated. Yet nice questions are practically occurring every day, touching the administrator, for instance, or baptism administered in the proper form among denominations of a different faith. The histories of our denomination have occasionally glanced at these questions as they have presented themselves, but our set treatises remain silent. We have turned to Hinton's "History of Baptism," where, from the title, something might have been expected on these points; but nothing is to be found.

In a Defence of Infant Baptism by Dr. Pond, we remember to have seen that the Orthodox Congregationalists of New England had admitted the validity of baptisms performed by Unitarians. What they would do with those of Roman Catholics, we do not know. The Presbyterians would for the most part, probably, repeat lay-baptism; but how far that of other denominations, is not settled. The Methodists are flexible on all these points. The Church of England, it has recently been decided, considers "the minister not an essential part of the sacrament of baptism." But the Episcopalians in this country are silently assuming different ground, since the appearance of Dr. Ogilby's work.

It is proposed in the present article to consider in what cases baptism ought to be esteemed valid, and when to be

repeated. To save time and avoid ambiguity, we remark that we shall use the word "baptism," in the following pages, for the immersion of the body in water in the name of the Trinity, as a profession of Christianity.

We commence by laying down a few simple scriptural principles, to guide our subsequent discussions.

It is plainly taught in the New Testament that valid baptism is to be submitted to once, and but once; that as we have one Lord and one faith, so we should have but one baptism. To rebaptize is to assert not only the irregularity, but the invalidity of the former rite.

It may be regarded as equally certain, and by all admitted, that nothing *ex post facto* can invalidate this ordinance, so as to render it proper that it should be repeated; for although cases of the grossest crimes committed after baptism are recorded in the New Testament,—cases in which the guilty persons are exhorted to "repent and to pray," they are not exhorted to be rebaptized, nor does the propriety of such a course seem even to have been contemplated. (Acts 8: 19, 20.) And when such are about to be restored to the church, though they are to be "received" and "comforted," the repetition of their baptism is not hinted at. (2 Cor. 2: 7.)*

There certainly is not more than one instance of rebaptism distinctly recorded in the whole of Scripture. Even that has been questioned. The silence of Scripture teaches as well as what it asserts; and we thus learn that baptism should not be repeated in a light or unnecessary manner.

It will now be proper to consider, perhaps at some length, this unique case, on account of its direct bearing upon the subject in hand, and the difficulties which the criticisms of the last three hundred years have thrown around it. It is recorded Acts 19: 1-5. We will inquire, What was the nature of the baptism?—if it was repeated—and if it was, upon what ground?

As to the nature of the baptism; it certainly was so nearly like Christian baptism as this, that it gave those who had received it a *prima facie* title to the character of "disciples" (ver. 1) and of "believers" (ver. 2.) That

* This rule was strictly adhered to by the Fathers even among the Cyprianists. Euseb. Ecc. Hist. Lib. 7, cap. 7.

St. Paul had before conversed with these twelve, and that they had professed themselves properly baptized is clearly to be inferred, as Bloomfield remarks, from the question "unto what then were ye baptized?" (*Recensio Synoptica*, Acts 19: 2.) It seems equally evident that they were a distinct society from the Jews, and received by St. Paul at first as validly baptized. If they were rebaptized, it was not until he discovered a deficiency, from their own remarks;—it was not from the beginning determined on, but an after-thought.

It is evident that these persons were grossly ignorant of fundamental articles of faith. They appear in that ordinance to have professed faith only in John the Baptist, without any reference to "him that should come after him," of whom they needed to be informed; and had "not so much as heard whether there were any Holy Ghost;"—to have heard these truths with surprise (ver. 5.) It is probable that they had conceived John to be the Messiah and looked no further, or perhaps thought him superior to Jesus. Many of the disciples of John, we know, had shown a tendency to these ideas during the lifetime of their master, (John 3: 26,) as a little after did some of the heretical sects—for instance, the Cerinthians.

We must therefore regard this baptism as essentially defective in its nature.

But was it repeated? This depends upon how we regard the fifth verse; whether as Luke's narrative of what occurred to these twelve disciples, or as a part of St. Paul's account of the doctrine and practice of John. If the former, they were rebaptized; if the latter, they were not. It is a good rule in interpreting Scripture that the sense that would most obviously strike a plain, intelligent reader of the Bible, is generally the true sense. And it will hardly be questioned that the most obvious meaning of this passage to an English reader without any theological bias would here be, that the baptism was repeated. It requires some effort of mind to discover any other sense.

"And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul, having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them,

Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Jesus Christ. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." Acts xix. 1-6.

Nor is this the effect of translation. It is the most obvious meaning of the original. The opinions of all the early commentators furnish the most complete proof of this. "All the Fathers, without exception, who have touched on the subject," says R. Hall, "have considered that these persons were rebaptized"—nor has a single exception been produced. Amidst all kinds of questions and controversies as to rebaptizing, this passage, often appealed to, is by opposite parties quoted in this one only sense for three hundred years. Although it was brought forward in triumph by the Cyprianists, in insisting on the repetition of heretical baptisms, although the Augustinian party had every interest in showing that this was probably, or even but possibly, not the true meaning, and although the Fathers are so zealous in pressing each doubtful text into their interest, at the expense of all criticism and common sense if necessary, not one of them seems to have thought any other rendering of this passage plausible enough even to form the foundation for a doubt as to its meaning. For fifteen hundred years it was probably the unquestioned opinion that Luke here asserted the rebaptism of these disciples. It is doubtful if all this can be said of any other passage of Scripture, that shall prove, at last, to have been erroneously interpreted.

Tertullian, from whom Cyprian derived his predilection for rebaptizing, quotes it as decidedly in his favor, and Augustine on the other side represents the Cyprianists as arguing that if these persons who had been baptized unto John's baptism were required to have the ordinance repeated, much more those who were converted from the heretics. Augustine does not attempt to controvert the fact, but only the reasoning, and goes on to show why, nevertheless, heretics should not be rebaptized. Chrysostom says that Paul spoke to them with this "purpose in view, that he might teach and persuade them to be rebaptized in the name of Jesus—which they were."

Probably not a single writer previous to the time of Calvin, doubted the rebaptism of these persons; and he plainly adopted his interpretation from theological motives. The Anabaptists drew, he conceived, dangerous inferences from this passage, not only against the validity of infant baptism, but even that of adults administered by other sects. With the view of more effectually opposing them, he asserted that the baptism mentioned in verse five was the baptism of the Holy Spirit. (See Calvin's *Inst.* lib. 4, cap. 16, sec. 18.) Beza and others, with the same theological views as Calvin, introduced a new interpretation of the text, and maintained that the fifth verse was only a continuation of St. Paul's address. Dr. Gill, and after him some English and many American Baptists, have also advocated the modern opinion. In this they have been opposed by most of the Pædobaptist divines, as Stuart, Barnes, etc. This change of positions between Baptists and Pædobaptists would at first appear strange, and contrary to the theological views of the respective parties; yet the attentive reader will perceive that it is the desire of maintaining more firmly that John's baptism is in no way essentially different from that administered under our Lord's commission, which has induced these Baptists to acquiesce in Beza's interpretation. Some of our best writers, however, advocate the ancient opinion; Dr. Ripley, for instance, in his *Notes on Stuart on Baptism*.

This view of the history of opinions shows beyond question that the more plain and natural interpretation of this passage is that these disciples were rebaptized. Strong theological or critical necessity must be adduced, before we should relinquish the most ancient and obvious construction of the passage.

Let us consider now the weight of those theological reasons which may have induced any to favor the new interpretation. The first, i. e. that it would tend to invalidate those baptisms received in gross and palpable ignorance of the true nature of Christianity, as the baptism of infants, will not weigh much with us. Another has usually been thought the more important, i. e. that it seems to make an essential distinction between Christian baptism and that of John, those who had received the one being yet obliged to submit to the other. It is thus

used by R. Hall. But we have already seen that this was a case of baptism administered on a profession of faith, but in which the belief of the subjects was essentially defective. Hence the repetition of baptism in this case would not in the least affect the question of the identity of Christian baptism with that of John. Theological considerations, therefore, if they are ever to be allowed to weigh in our interpretations of Scripture, should here at least leave our minds unfettered; the question must be decided on grounds strictly critical.

But one such argument has been adduced in favor of the modern interpretation. It is that the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ in verse four and the $\delta\epsilon$ in verse five are corresponding particles, and that therefore the fifth verse must be a continuation of Paul's address. But then the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ does not necessarily require that this particle shall follow it. In the New Testament, as in the classics, the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ is used without the $\delta\epsilon$ quite frequently; not only with other particles, such as $\gamma\alpha\rho$ and $\kappa\alpha\iota$, but even without any other corresponding particle in its place where the corresponding clause is expressed, but the $\delta\epsilon$ omitted by ellipsis—or, where the whole corresponding clause is implied, but not inserted—or where no corresponding clause is either expressed or implied. Then the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ simply means *indeed, truly*. We might therefore suppose it used here in this latter sense without any corresponding clause, as in Acts 3: 21, and as the English translators suppose here. But it seems to us preferable to regard it, as Robinson does, as a case in which the whole of the corresponding clause is implied but not expressed, and might be thus supplied—"John indeed baptized saying unto the people that they should believe on him that should come after him but your baptism has been quite a different affair."* "And when they heard this, they were baptized," etc. Instances of a precisely similar use of the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ without the $\delta\epsilon$ occur, Rom. 1: 8; 7: 12; 10: 1. 2 Cor. 12: 12. Col. 3: 23, and in the very same book, ch. 1: 1. In ch. 28: 22, the apodosis is inverted, but there a $\delta\epsilon$ follows the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ more closely in the sentence, although it is clearly not used as a corresponding particle.

* Poole, in his annotations on the clause,—“John indeed baptized”—gives it as his own opinion that this is the proposition of a syllogism where the assumption is hinted—“But you were not baptized in the name of Jesus.”

If indeed in Acts 19: 4, 5, it were already proved that the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\delta\epsilon$ were both included in Paul's speech, it would be fair to urge that they were probably corresponding particles; but it is inadmissible to insist that the fifth verse is a continuation of Paul's speech, in order that the $\delta\epsilon$ may correspond with the $\mu\epsilon\nu$. As well might it be argued that in chap. 28, the 23d verse is a continuation of the speech of the Jews in verse 22, because accidentally a $\delta\epsilon$ follows the $\mu\epsilon\nu$. The order in both passages clearly is, just to determine from the sense where the speeches end, and by that be guided in ascertaining what are corresponding particles. If, in the passage under consideration, St. Paul's address concludes with the fourth verse, there is nothing unusual in the construction of the sentence, but a form precisely like that used by the same writer in the same book. The $\mu\epsilon\nu$ is even altogether a doubtful reading, and so marked by Knapp.

On the other hand, it would be of itself sufficient to make Beza's interpretation very questionable, that we should thus be taught that John always baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus," which all concede he did not, but in the name of the coming Messiah; for John "knew him not" personally at first, and even after his imprisonment sent messengers to ask, "art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" (See Rec. Syn. Acts 19: 5.) Nor is it to be supposed that Paul could unthinkingly use a form of expression in verse five, which he had taken such pains to avoid in verse four. There, in stating in whose name John baptized, he adopts a circuitous form of expression—"him that should come after him," adding his own paraphrase—"that is, on Christ Jesus."

Again, the fifth and sixth verses are much more obviously connected than the fourth and fifth. The style of Luke in the sixth verse is certainly not that which is usual in resuming the thread of an interrupted narrative:—"And when Paul had laid his hands on them," etc., but it *is* in the fifth, "when they heard this, they were baptized," etc. Supposing the speech to stop at verse four, we have an address pointing out to these persons the contrast between their baptism and that of John, while in verse five we learn the effect of that address upon the hearers. But upon the other supposition, St.

Paul's object must have been to teach them the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, in which case the whole of his speech would be irrelevant, even the climax of it not touching the point. And yet they are supposed to have been convinced without argument, and already to have submitted to the apostle's hands without any reason being given, before the narrative is resumed!

Still another difficulty remains, equally formidable. The relative pronoun in the sixth verse, agreeing with its natural antecedent in the fifth, would, according to Beza's construction of the passage—as R. Hall remarks, make it appear that St. Paul laid his hands not only on all these twelve, but on all John's disciples:—a conclusion, indeed, upheld by none; but only avoided by the unnatural expedient of referring back for an antecedent to the "them" in verse six—beyond the most obvious, to the much more remote one in the third verse. It has been urged that, by adopting the other view, we should have a somewhat similar irregularity of construction; but obviously so much less in degree, that we can be at no loss which to prefer. "Examples may be adduced where the relative pronoun is connected with an antecedent equally remote; but none, most assuredly, where its relation to an immediate antecedent is so obvious and so natural, that the true interpretation, in opposition to that which presents itself at first sight, becomes a perfect enigma." "Any instance of such a construction as that proposed is not to be found, not merely in the New Testament, but in the whole compass of Greek literature." R. Hall's works, vol. 1, p. 386. Phil. 1842.

Upon the whole, therefore, there can be no doubt that Luke resumes his narrative in the fifth verse, and consequently that these twelve disciples were rebaptized.

The ground of this repetition of baptism may now be easily shown. Two reasons alone are possible. 1. That their first baptism was regarded, as they considered it, i. e. a case only of John's baptism. 2. That on account of the ignorance they manifested of a Messiah and of the Holy Ghost, the baptism was esteemed fundamentally defective.

The first of these opinions, i. e. that their former baptism was regarded as a case only of John's baptism, and

therefore to be repeated, as if it were invalid, is opposed by overwhelming objections.

In no other case can it be shown that those who had received John's baptism, regularly administered, were afterwards rebaptized. Not a single passage can be adduced, except the one in question, at all favorable to such an opinion.* But, on the contrary, from the uniform tenor of the New Testament it is plain that, however in some minor respects different, baptism, whether administered by John or the disciples of Jesus, was esteemed so essentially the same as not to be repeated. Both were for the same sort of persons, i. e. penitents, Matt. 3: 8, Acts 2: 38. The object of both was the same:—to profess faith in the Messiah, either as to come, or as having come. Acts 19: 4, Matt. 28: 19. And both were "for the remission of sins." Mark 1: 4, Acts 2: 38. It is true indeed that Tertullian and the Greek fathers speak of the baptism of John as not the baptism of remission, but only of repentance, and therefore imperfect; but we cannot hesitate to consider them in error, as Poole justly remarks, with the decisive passage in Mark before us.

In the case of Apollos, mentioned in the 18th chapter of Acts, we have a plain instance of a disciple of John being received into the Christian church without rebaptism. Dr. Bloomfield (*Rec. Syn. in hoc loco*) indeed, following Ernesti, says that the second baptism is not mentioned, but "passed by as a thing well known and usual." But in this he does not seem supported by the passage. Though "knowing only the baptism of John," Apollos is described as from the first "instructed in the way of the Lord," and "teaching diligently the things of the Lord." And although we are told the very names of the persons who

* Doddridge, R. Hall and Bloomfield have maintained that some of John's former disciples were, in all probability, rebaptized among the three thousand added to the church on the day of Pentecost. But the multitude whom Peter exhorted to repent and be baptized were mostly foreigners attending the feast, Acts 2: 9-11. If there were among the three thousand, any who had previously been the disciples of John, they might, as a matter of course, have been restored without being rebaptized, as the old disciples of Jesus would have been. It was only new penitents, those just "pricked in their hearts" and "converted," that Peter invited to baptism. Perhaps the terms employed in Luke's narrative almost involve, that more were added to the church than were baptized. "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls."

instructed him "more perfectly," and that they wrote to the disciples elsewhere to receive him as a Christian brother, and although we are told of his reception as a brother and a teacher, no hint is given that he was again baptized; but if ever the silence of Scripture teaches, we are here to learn from it that he was not. Indeed it is indicated most plainly that they regarded him as "a disciple" and one of themselves, before he was "instructed" of Priscilla and Aquila:—an instruction, be it remarked, not designed to alter his faith, but only to make him "more perfectly" acquainted with a religion, of which he had, impliedly, already imbibed the rudiments. The alteration produced in his views was only in degree, not in character. There was, therefore, no sufficiently marked change for a new baptism to express; and if not in him, then not in any who like him were "fervent in spirit, knowing only the baptism of John." Neither Apollos, therefore, nor any who had regularly received John's baptism, were rebaptized on being received into the Christian churches. It could not be on this account, therefore, that the baptism of these disciples was repeated.

2. In confirmation of this, be it observed, that while St. Paul considered them as John's disciples, he considered them as validly baptized. It has been before remarked, upon the phrase "unto what then were ye baptized?"—that the repetition of their baptism arose unexpectedly, after they had been recognized as disciples, out of something that transpired in their conversation.

It can hardly be supposed that St. Paul knew them as a society of baptized persons separate from the Jews, without knowing that they claimed to be disciples of John rather than of Jesus, so far as there was any distinction made. It seems probable, as Dr. Bloomfield suggests, that Apollos may have first discovered them, and informed the apostle of their existence and character. The greater the distinction between the disciples of John and Jesus, the more improbable would it be that their baptisms should be confounded. St. Paul therefore considered them the subjects of John's baptism when he spoke. Considering them such only, he recognizes them as 'disciples,' and their baptism as valid. But after he has discovered something further from their conversation, he retracts this concession and requires them to be rebap-

tized, drawing thus an essential distinction between their baptism and that of John, and showing on what grounds he now required them to be "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," i. e. the essentially defective character of their first baptism.

These persons were rebaptized, then, because their former baptism was not an open avowal of their personal faith in the fundamental principles of Christian doctrine, which is the object and essence of this ordinance; and, the object not being attained, it was right the baptism should be considered void.

We gather, then, from this brief examination of scriptural principles, these three rules, which will aid and guide our subsequent investigations.

I. That baptism is invalid, and may and ought to be repeated, however externally correct the form, in cases of such obvious and gross ignorance of the Christian system, as to render the ordinance not a profession of faith in the fundamental principles of Christianity.

II. That in all other cases, a baptism is to be esteemed valid.

III. That valid baptism ought not to be repeated.

To apply now these principles which have been deduced from Scripture, to various cases.

I. Cases in which baptism shall have been administered in a manner not inadmissible, but during infancy; as, for instance, the baptisms of the Greek Church. When a member of that church, having been immersed in infancy, is converted, ought he to be rebaptized? Unquestionably; since the baptism was not, at the time it was received, a profession of the personal faith of the subject of it in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

It will perhaps be here objected, that although the baptism be not valid until confirmed by the personal faith and act of the baptized, yet when afterwards it is thus ratified, it becomes valid without being renewed. We consider this the more carefully, as it is the most specious argument used in favor of infant baptism in this day. It is unquestionably true that after a person has once taken on himself the vows made by his sponsors at his baptism, he is bound not only by the general law of his duty to God, but still more specifically by his assumption of those promises. Yet it does not follow that his baptism is valid.

It is the promise he has made, and not the baptism, that binds him. He may, by his promise, place himself under the obligations to lead the life of the baptized, but cannot claim its privileges, without complying anew with its requirements.

This distinction between a man being bound by his promise in such a case, and being bound by the baptism, may be illustrated by the following legal decision of Lord Ellenborough, one of the highest English authorities.

John Dinely, while a minor, gave Baylis a penal bond for £100. On coming of age, he ratified and confirmed the bond, but subsequently refused to pay, and pleaded that "the bond being void *ab origine*, cannot be ratified and confirmed in any way, because confirmation implies the existence of the thing to be confirmed;" that, therefore, "neither a new promise or new delivery would make the bond good which was originally void." And it was said, on the other side, that if the bond was set aside, it would follow "that in no possible way could an infant after full age affirm such an obligation." The bond was pronounced invalid, on the ground that it required "the act after full age to be of as great solemnity as the original instrument." See Maule and Selyn's Rep. 477. Hence it is a principle of common law, that a penal bond "being void," even if affirmed, the action to recover "must always be founded on the new promise and not on the bond." See American Common Law.

To make the illustration, however, completely parallel, it ought to be supposed that instead of J. D. having signed the bond himself, his guardian, during his infancy, should have affixed his ward's name, without his knowledge or consent. What subsequent affirmation could render such a bond a legal instrument, or its seal binding? Any precedence before other debts which a bond might give would have to be waived; and if the other party were entitled to such advantage, it would be the duty of J. D. to give a new bond altogether, which would have a force which the old one, however ratified, could not be made to possess.

To apply now this illustration. Baptism is, so to speak, the sealed instrument, acknowledging our obligations to lead a Christian life. The sponsors in the Greek Church

vow and covenant in the name of an infant, without any authority from him. Arrived at years of discretion and become a Christian, this infant takes these vows upon himself. Doubtless he is bound to lead the Christian life; but it is his own act, not his baptism that binds him. As we have seen that nothing *ex post facto* can invalidate a baptism, so by no subsequent process can a baptism, originally void, be rendered valid. The ordinance being "the sign and seal" which marks the difference, and makes it, so to speak, a bond rather than a mere promise, owing to the incompetence of the parties at the time, is worthless and incapable of being rendered good. A Christian, therefore, in such a situation, desiring the privilege of baptism, is now bound to submit to the ordinance of baptism, just as in the case mentioned as an illustration he would be bound to give a new bond; his first immersion not having been a profession of personal faith in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. Upon these grounds, not only Baptists, but all those in other communions who do not believe infant baptism divinely commanded, are bound to treat it as utterly invalid, however externally correct the mode of its administration, or afterwards affirmed by the personal assumption of its vows.*

II. We next consider the case of those who, though adults, baptized in the proper mode and form, yet at that

* In this country, it is well known that a large and increasing number of intelligent members of nearly all Pædobaptist denominations do not consider the baptism of infants divinely commanded, but as rendered valid by the subsequent faith of the subject. This class of persons has, in late years, much increased in numbers and respectability. In Germany, Neander, a Pædobaptist, declares it "certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism," and that "we cannot prove that the apostles" did; that even in the second century, in the time of Tertullian, "it was not usually considered as an apostolical ordinance." But he states that "the theory of the unconditional necessity of infant baptism developed itself from the idea" "that without outward baptism no one could be freed from inherited guilt, saved from eternal punishment, or brought to eternal happiness." He even cannot find proof that "this idea was generally received by the North African church," until "the middle of the third century;" yet thinks infant baptism useful, and in a mild way advocates it. See Neander's Church History, pub. by Campbell, p. 198-200. In England, the same views are singularly developed by Mr. Coleridge in his Aids to Reflection, p. 318-19. He there apologises for the church exercising a supposed authority to alter the time of baptism to infancy, on the ground that its being thus early administered is "better calculated to prevent the ceremony from being regarded as other and more than a mere ceremony." But how shall we reconcile this with what he says elsewhere (in his Literary Remains), that "infant baptism supposes and most certainly encourages a belief concerning God the most blasphemous and intolerable," namely, that the want of it may occasion their "eternal loss?"

time held grossly heretical doctrines; of adherence to which their baptism was a profession to the world; such as Unitarians, who deny the proper faith of the Trinity;—Universalists, who deny all future punishment;—Campbellites, whose acknowledgment that Jesus is the Son of God implies neither a belief in the divinity or vicarious sufferings of Christ, nor a profession of a change of heart. Even the Mormons, it is said, baptize in the name of Jesus. When persons who may have been baptized in a profession of any of these forms of error, are afterwards brought to the truth as it is in Jesus, is it their duty to be rebaptized? In such cases the first baptism is surely to be regarded rather as a profession of disbelief, than of belief in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. It should therefore be esteemed quite invalid, and be repeated by those who embrace orthodox doctrines. Nor can their subsequent faith make good their former baptism.

It was thus St. Paul decided, as we have already seen in the nineteenth of Acts. 'These disciples had been baptized. There was one only defect; i. e. their baptism was received in such utter and open ignorance of the principles of Christianity, that it was not a profession of the Christian faith. When they received the true faith, it was necessary to settle this question,—Whether a baptism, in which there is not at the time a profession of fundamental Christianity, can be rendered valid by any subsequent process? This question was then settled by St. Paul for all coming time. The form of baptism had been sufficiently complied with; the same form was used which had been esteemed good for John's disciples generally:—whatever deficiency there was at first, arising from their ignorance, was now removed by their superior light. But he pronounced the baptism invalid *in toto*, because it was not the profession of personal faith in the fundamental principles of Christianity at the time it was made.

The case of the Free-Will, or Arminian Baptists, is different. Upon all fundamental points of doctrine, their faith is precisely the same as ours, and they baptize only by immersion on a profession of evangelical faith. They differ from us upon the doctrine of the divine decrees, and in admitting those whom they consider unbaptized to the Lord's table. As baptism is a profession of faith only in the fundamental principles of Christianity,

these errors cannot invalidate their confession of Christ in this ordinance. Of those baptized among ourselves, many do not understand all the minute points of our peculiar belief, until they have been for years instructed in the Christian church. The Saviour expressly leaves many things to be taught after baptism. If the baptisms of evangelical Free-Will Baptists were esteemed void, it would follow that there could be no valid baptism, in which a correct belief in all the minutiae of Baptist doctrine and church polity were not professed.

III. The case of those who received baptism in an unrenewed state next deserves our consideration. Instances not unfrequently occur in our churches of persons regularly baptized on a profession of faith, who afterwards think they were not converted, and sometimes really were not at the time of their baptism, but now appear to be so;—ought they to be rebaptized?

In favor of rebaptizing, it may be urged that upon the supposition of their not having been converted, their baptism was a wrong act, done either hypocritically or in gross ignorance of the nature of Christianity.

On the other hand, it is not every thing which is wrongly done, that is invalid when done; and although there may have been ignorance in the heart at the time of the baptism, yet the confession of the mouth was correct. The baptism was a credible profession of personal faith in the fundamental truths of Christianity. There was therefore no defect in the baptism or outward profession, but in the heart or inward state. The baptism being without defect, is valid and should not be repeated. The case mentioned in the nineteenth of Acts is the reverse, rather than the parallel of the one we are supposing. There the baptism was not a credible profession to the world, of faith in Jesus or the Holy Ghost; here, it is.

And further, the work of grace is often so gradual upon the heart, that the truly pious find it difficult to tell the precise time when they were regenerated. As also they grow in holiness, they elevate the standard oftentimes of what is necessary to conversion in such a way as to exclude their earlier religious character from the pale of their charity; and this, although conscious that they were throughout perfectly sincere, and although there may really have been from the beginning the germs of the

heavenly character. The bright sunshine they now enjoy makes the earlier beams of daylight appear as darkness. Must all such conclude their first baptism invalid? If the first seems invalid now, the second may shortly, and where shall we stop?—when be sure that they are baptized? Every doubt of a former professed confession would moot the question.

Even where it can be ascertained that the individual was not at first savingly enlightened, rebaptism is not necessary, and therefore is improper. For he can never more solemnly declare what he professed at first, and it is difficult to perceive how, by acknowledging himself to have made a false first profession, we shall gain any additional certainty of the truth of a second.

But further, by rebaptizing, we directly affirm that the vows made in the first instance are not valid and binding—else why renew them? But they are binding and never can be thrown off. It is highly important that the doctrine should be upheld in the church, that no subsequent abandonment of them can in any way destroy their validity, or impair their obligation.

Accordingly, the apostles never seem in such cases, to have contemplated for a moment rebaptism; but when St. Paul was writing concerning “the incestuous person,” the enormity of whose crimes might well have awakened the suspicion that he was not at first truly converted, though he charges them to “restore” and even to “comfort” him, he does not seem to consider him a possible subject for rebaptism. And though Peter, who to sinners even of the vilest character every where preached “repent and be baptized, every one of you,” told Simon Magus that he had neither “part nor lot in the matter,” and that “his heart was not right in the sight of God,” while he exhorted him to “repent” and to “pray,” he never so much as hinted to him the duty of being rebaptized.

This always has been the view taken by the regular Baptist churches of this country. In the Charleston Association it was questioned (see Furman’s Hist. Chas. Asso. p. 37) “Whether it is warrantable to baptize a second time a person who at first was baptized in an unconverted state? Ans. In the negative.”

Another more full answer was given to the same query, some years afterwards—the same in substance. See Min. Charleston Ass. 1825, also 1812 and 1758. See also Semple's *Hist. Virginia Baptists*, p. 97. Whatever occasional exceptions may have occurred in the practice of churches, seem to have arisen from a desire to accommodate the consciences of weak brethren.

IV. The validity of lay-baptism is next to be considered. Although not frequently, it has sometimes happened that lay members of the church have baptized, where no minister could be procured. That such a practice is usually inexpedient and disorderly, in the present state of our churches, and to be most seriously discountenanced, it is presumed none will question. We wish now to consider, however, whether such baptism be absolutely void and to be repeated.

On many accounts, the validity of lay-baptism is to be maintained. Certainly we cannot pretend to any thing like an unbroken succession of regularly ordained men. Many excellent Baptists do not even believe in ordination. In the primitive church, indeed, the distinction between clergy and laity was much less marked than it has since become (see D'Aubigné's *Hist. Refor.* vol. 1, p. 16, 17.)

In the first ages, the office of baptizing was by no means confined to the ministry. "At first," says Mosheim, "all who were engaged in propagating Christianity administered this rite; nor can it be called in question that whoever persuaded any person to embrace Christianity, could baptize his own disciple. But when the churches became more regulated and were provided with rules of order, the bishop alone exercised the right of baptizing." Cent. I, cap. iv, sec. 8. Yet as late as Cyprian and Jerome, lay-baptism "was not uncommon," "a custom ratified by the Fathers of the Iberine Council (Cave *Hist. Prim. Christianity*, chap. 10, p. 145).

Hilary, in the fourth century, commenting on Eph. 4: 11, 12, says that "at first, that is in primitive times, before churches were every where established, all taught and all baptized, on whatever days or times there was occasion." Again he says, that "at first it was conceded to all to evangelize and to baptize, and to explain the Scriptures in the church."

As the validity of lay-baptism has been much discussed in some quarters, especially of late years, owing to the unwarranted pretensions of some Episcopalians, who prefer to rebaptize all who come to them from other churches, it will not be unprofitable here to give a brief sketch of the history of opinions on this subject, to show how completely, to use the language of Bishop Bilson, such persons "do cross all the antiquity," for correspondence with which they pride themselves. Ignatius indeed tells us that "it is lawful neither to preach nor to baptize without the bishop." But if the passage is genuine, it only proves the impropriety, not the invalidity of lay-baptism, in his esteem. Tertullian, after saying that with the bishop resides the authority to baptize, "and after him the presbyters and deacons, yet not without his authority," adds, "in another respect, laymen have also a right to give it; for what is received in common may be given in common. Baptism is God's peculiar gift, and may be conferred by all; but laymen are in a much greater degree obliged by the rules of modesty in the use of their power, since they who are superior to them are obliged not to assume to themselves the office which belongs to the bishop only." The Council of Eliberis admits the validity and propriety of lay-baptism in cases of necessity. Augustine says, "there is in the sacrament the authority of the commission which our Saviour gave to his apostles, and by them to bishops and other priests, and even to laymen, descending from the same stock and original;" and though he declares that in ordinary cases it is a great usurpation for a layman to baptize, yet he is of opinion that baptism performed by a layman without necessity, though improper, is valid. "Though it be usurped without necessity, and given by any man to another, that which is given cannot be said not to be given, though it may be said to be unlawfully given." Hence he would have the guilty repent, but not the baptism repeated. In writing against the Donatists, his principal argument is that whatever be the character of the administrator, Christ alone presides in it. Calvin's *Inst. B.* 4. c. 15, sect. 8. Optatus goes a little further. "Our Lord," he says, "gave commandment in whose name the nations should be baptized; but he did not determine without exception by whom they should be baptized. He said not to his disciples, this shall ye do,

and no other shall do it. For whoever baptizes in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, fulfils the work of the apostles." The Romanists, to this day, admit the validity of lay, and even of woman's baptism. Dens, *Theo. de Baptismo*, N. 12, 4.

At the period of the Reformation, this subject was keenly discussed. In the reign of Edward VI, an injunction in favor of lay-baptism, in certain cases, was issued—an injunction only retracted by King James I, against the protest of the Bench of Bishops. Even then it was not forbidden. Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, asserts the validity of lay-baptism most strongly, affirming that "to deny it were to cross all antiquity;" and that "it was a rule agreed upon by divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament." Archbishop Whitgift says, "the dignity of the sacraments does not depend upon the man, be he minister or no minister, be he good or evil;" and that otherwise "there had need be some general baptismization throughout all Christendom." "And certainly," he adds, "if the being of the sacrament depended upon man in any respect, we were but in a miserable case; for we should always be in doubt whether we were rightly baptized or no." Archbishop Abbott, in his *Theological Lectures*, maintains the same opinion. First, because the person of the minister is not of the essence or being of the sacrament, only of its well being. Secondly, he argues from the maxim of law, *multa fieri non debent, quæ tamen facta valent*. Thirdly, from the perpetual consent and practice of the church. In the Church of England within the last three years, the validity of lay-baptism has been decided by the Ecclesiastical Court. In the case of *Mustir v. Escott*, Vicar of Godney, Lincolnshire, it was decided by the judge that "the law of the Church of England is beyond all doubt that a child baptized by a layman is validly baptized."

On the continent, Luther, Calvin, and Zwinglius upheld the validity of lay-baptism. See D'Aubigné's *Hist. Refor.* vol. 2, p. 88; Calvin's *Inst. B.* 4, c. 15, sect. 16; and for an extended and most able treatise on the subject, Bingham's *Scholastic Hist. of Lay-Baptism*, to which we have been indebted for many of the passages above from the Fathers and Reformers.

In our own denomination, we have never been able to

find an instance of baptism being repeated, when administered in proper form by a baptized layman. Some of our Confessions of Faith, the Philadelphia and Charleston Confessions, for instance, recognize the minister as the only proper person to baptize in ordinary cases; yet do not deny its validity, when administered by laymen; while there are several important instances in the history of the denomination, in which lay-baptism has been considered valid. It is sufficient barely to advert here to the case of Roger Williams, whose baptism by Holliman, a layman, has been defended by Knowles, Benedict, and all our writers.

So able and cautious a theologian as Andrew Fuller speaks with strong confidence of the validity and even propriety of the lay administration of the Lord's Supper, in the case of churches destitute of a pastor, as well as of their receiving and excluding members, and appointing deacons. He wishes that in such cases, instead of sending for a neighboring pastor, they "would attend to the Lord's Supper among themselves." He admits, however, that there were probably but few brethren of his mind, and elsewhere counsels a young licentiate not to administer the communion until after ordination. See Fuller's Works, vol. 2, p. 662. Tertullian, in ancient times, seems to have held to the validity of the lay administration of the Eucharist. See Campbell's Lect. Ecc. Hist. IV. Superior dignity has usually been attached to the administration of this ordinance. If it can be received from lay hands, baptism may.

It has sometimes been thought that our Saviour's commission to the eleven virtually excludes all but ministers from baptizing. The remarks of the judicious Dr. Campbell upon this passage in his fourth Lect. on Ecc. Hist. are so pertinent, that we lay them before our readers.

"The first order to the Eleven to make converts, baptize, and teach, carries in it nothing from which we can discover it was a commission intrusted to them exclusively as apostles or ministers, and not given also as Christians; and that the apostles were particularized, because best qualified from their long attendance on Christ's ministry for promoting his religion in the world, but not with a view to exclude any Christians who were capable, from coöperating with them in the same good cause. Philip, though no apostle, and probably at that time no more than a deacon, that is, a trustee for the poor in matters purely secular,

did all for the Ethiopian eunuch, which the apostles had in charge to all nations. He instructed, baptized, and taught him. No reasonable man can doubt that any private Christian was then and is still warranted, if he can, to convert an infidel and to teach him the principles of Christianity. Yet these are two important parts of the apostolic commission; if I should say the most important parts, I should not speak without warrant. Nothing here advanced can justly be understood to combat the propriety of limiting, for the sake of discipline, the power of baptizing to fewer hands than that of preaching, when once a fixed ministry is settled in a church."

Upon the whole, Dr. T. Smyth, a distinguished Presbyterian, considers that the "commission was not given to the apostles, but to all the disciples, as representatives of the church universal." See *Presbyterianism not Prelacy*, Script. Polity, p. 76. The teachings of Scripture and the history of theological opinions would alike lead us to embrace this view,—that while now, in ordinary cases, lay-baptism is to be discountenanced as irregular and highly improper, yet that if administered to the proper persons and in proper form, it is valid and not to be repeated.

V. The validity of baptisms administered by Pædobaptist ministers. A case of this kind not unfrequently occurs. An individual who has not been sprinkled in infancy receives the grace of God under the preaching of a Congregationalist, Presbyterian, or Methodist minister. He desires to be, and is, immersed. Upon further examination, he wishes to become a member of a Baptist church. Shall he be rebaptized? Or, is his previous baptism to be esteemed good?

In considering this case, we must of course regard the administrator as unbaptized, and there is plainly an inconsistency in a person applying for baptism to such an one. It is irregular, and to be in all suitable ways discountenanced; indeed, it should seem that a love of order and consistency should lead those who are in the habit of speaking against our ways, not to try how closely they can imitate them. But on the other hand, the baptized person may be just converted, and not even aware of any irregularity in his course; and not until after baptism, is he to be taught "all things" relating to church discipline and order.

The question, it will be observed, is not—whether one

unbaptized is properly qualified to administer baptism. He clearly is not. But, although the baptism be irregularly administered, it still remains to be considered whether it is or is not valid when administered. The ancient axiom of law above cited, has, for hundreds of years, been applied to many cases in theology; "*Multa fieri non debent, quæ tamen facta valent.*" In many of the states of the Union, should an ordained minister marry a couple without having a license, he would do an illegal action, and subject himself to a heavy fine, and perhaps other punishments; yet the marriage, if there were a *bona fide* intention of marriage by the parties, would not on that account be invalid, though irregular and improper. See Decisions Sup. Court, Alab., June term, 1844.

Before proceeding further, it will be proper, as on a former point, to examine at length the history of opinions upon this subject. As Baptists and as Protestants, we consult the Bible alone, as of final and decisive authority in matters of controversy; yet in determining what the Bible teaches, no wise man will ever be indifferent to the opinions of the ancients, or in haste to form one for himself until he has reviewed this subject in all the different lights in which various minds and circumstances have presented it. "One must really be perplexed," remarks the able author of *Ancient Christianity*, "when one sees the Christian with an historic Bible in his hand, and who by its aid commands a prospect over all the fields of time and far into the regions of eternity, yet thinking that certain intermediate periods are nothing to him. . . . The forming an acquaintance, so far as we possess the means of opening it, with our brethren and fellow citizens and precursors in the Christian commonwealth, we owe to their virtues and sufferings, and we owe it also to their errors and illusions." p. 51.

In tracing this history down to the Reformation, as Baptists it will be necessary for us to bear in mind the erroneous views of many of the Fathers upon other points, and to estimate how much these may have affected their judgments on this. Most of them believed that baptism was essential to salvation; and this may have made them unusually disposed to consider a baptism valid by whomsoever administered. On the other hand, the belief of most of them in the propriety of infant baptism must, in

certain cases, have disposed them strongly to make the administrator a greater index of the validity of a baptism, in proportion as the character of the subject was made less. Thus in cases of baptisms administered among schismatical or heretical sects, the question was, "Is A. B. baptized into the true Christian faith?" Beyond the divinely appointed form of words which most heretical sects complied with, there could be only two ways of ascertaining this; first, the professed faith of the candidate; second, that of the administrator. When the baptized was an infant, most, if not all, would naturally be made to depend upon the administrator. There are expressions, doubtless, in the writings of the Fathers, as we shall see, implying that the faith of the baptizer must be regarded as an index of that into which the party was baptized; and that, therefore, the latter must be treated precisely as the former would be. This might be a safe rule among Pædobaptists. It might even be taken for granted, where nothing to the contrary was shown, amongst ourselves; but could not be adopted as an inflexible rule against contrary evidence. More importance, it seems to us, ought to be attached to the professed sentiments of the subject than of the administrator, in determining the faith into which an individual was baptized.

It has been commonly believed and sometimes asserted, (Christian Index, June 2, 1843,) that for the first two hundred and fifty years of the Christian era, all, whether heretics or Catholics, agreed that out of the true church no valid baptism could be given. This is, however, a great mistake. The baptism given by heretics was certainly not only unauthorized, but *extra ecclesiam*; yet, as we shall see, generally esteemed sufficient and not to be repeated. Gieseler (vol. 1, p. 165, Phil. 1836,) justly remarks that up to the time of Stephen's controversy with Cyprian, "the custom common in Africa and Asia Minor of baptizing reclaimed heretics, had never been adopted at Rome." "Even in Africa, there began to be some doubt of its propriety." "Most European Christians," says Mosheim, "regarded the baptism administered by errorists as valid, and therefore received reclaimed heretics simply with imposition of hands and prayer." (Cent. 3, part 2, chap. 3.) And although two councils of the bishops around Carthage, got up for the purpose by Cyprian, de-

cided in favor of rebaptizing in such cases in 255-6, it created the most violent opposition, and Stephen, Bishop of Rome, even excluded Cyprian and all the Africans from their fellowship on no other account. "After the death of Stephen and Cyprian, peace seems to have been at once restored, and on the disputed subject, a middle opinion became the prevailing one," i. e. if it appeared that the heretical baptism had been administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, then the baptism was esteemed valid and perfect, on the laying on of hands; but if the name of the Trinity had not been used, the baptism was regarded invalid and repeated. (Gieseler, vol. 1, p. 166, note 18.) As to the Arians and some others, who used the name, but denied the true faith of the Trinity, there was still some question. So far from Catholics and heretics, however, agreeing to the rebaptism of all baptized out of the church, only the African section of it, with a few churches in Asia, for a moment countenanced the practice. They, doubtless, had received it through the influence of one man; whereas of the opposite view, Bingham says (Scholastic Hist. Lay Bap. chap. 1, sect. 20,) that Vincentius Lirinensis "fully vindicates Stephen's doctrine from the charge of novelty, and reckons it the true ancient Catholic opinion." Such certainly was the opinion of Eusebius in his day, who speaks of it as "the ancient practice," that those turning from heresy, instead of being baptized anew, "should only have imposition of hands with prayer." Lib. vii. cap. 2. Indeed in the Council of Arles, A. D. 314, the opinions of Cyprian are represented as peculiar to the Africans. "*De Afris, quod propriâ lege suâ utuntur, ut rebaptizent, placuit,*" etc. Upon the whole, therefore, it is quite clear, that as before the time of Stephen it had been allowed as "the true ancient Catholic opinion," that a baptism might be valid so far as not to need repetition, though the administrator should not be within the pale of the true church, so after the death of Cyprian, this became "the prevailing opinion" everywhere. So far, then, the administrator was not an essential part of the ordinance of baptism.

The decisions of the great Nicene Council confirm this view, and require no more in order to the validity of a baptism than we have seen was already required. Athanasius argues the gross doctrinal error of the minister, as a reason

for making a special exception against the baptism of Arians, who, he says, "do not baptize men into the faith of the Father and of the Son, but a Creator and a creature." It is here "the faith which men are baptized into," or profess in baptism, that Athanasius thinks so important; nor can it be shown that the administrator is regarded even by him further than as an index of that. It could hardly be otherwise; for Sozomen, in his *Ecc. Hist.*, relates of Athanasius that when a boy, playing with the rest of his companions, some formed a kind of church-society, others personated catechumens, and were, with all the usual formalities, baptized by Athanasius. Alexander, the Bishop of Alexandria, after consulting with his clergy, concluded that these children ought not to be rebaptized, but only added his confirmation. See *Cave Prim. Christianity*, cap. x, p. 145-6, (Oxford 1840.) The authenticity of this is indeed doubted, but only from its supposed improbability, while it is confirmed by "a cloud of witnesses." p. 93. The decision was clearly erroneous, but it shows how little, even in Africa, the character of the administrator was supposed to affect the validity of the baptism.

Optatus, the next writer on this subject, thinks that the name of the Trinity, the faith of the receiver and the administrator ought to concur in baptism, but adds, "these are not all of equal weight and necessity . . . the person of the administrator not being of equal authority with the other two." Whence he concludes "that baptism, administered in the name and faith of the Trinity, whatever the quality of the administrator might be," was not to be repeated. The Council of Laodicea orders that all such as have been baptized by the Novatians, the Photians, and Quartadeciman heretics, are to be received, only first anathematizing their heresies." Some other heretics, unsound in fundamental doctrines or supposed to be so, were to be rebaptized. The second general Council of Constantinople adopts the same principle; that is, they admit the validity of baptism administered by persons *extra ecclesiam*.

Augustine and Jerome are very decided upon this subject. The former says that the reason why the Nicene Council ordered the Paulinists to be rebaptized "was, because they did not observe the form and rule of bap-

tism ;" that is, they did not use "that form of evangelical words, without which it was not the baptism of Christ." And he says, further, that the Catholic Church did not usually repeat heretical baptisms, "because the baptism given by heretics is not, properly speaking, their baptism, but the baptism of Christ;" and he challenges the Donatists, against whom he is writing, to show any instance of any man that was ever rebaptized by the Catholics, after he had once been baptized in the name of the Trinity. Still further to show how clear his own mind was that the validity of baptism did not necessarily depend, in whole or in part, on the qualification of the administrator, he relates a story of a certain catechumen, who, being at sea and in danger of being cast away in a storm, was baptized by a penitent, i. e. one not baptized, as there was no other Christian in the ship with them; and he concludes upon it, that "no one could say that in such a case, a man who desired baptism in imminent danger of death was to be left unbaptized." Still further, he says that he "should not scruple to assert all those to have baptism, by whomsoever baptized (*quibuscunque*), that had received it with faith and without dissimulation, in the form of words which is prescribed by the gospel." See for most of the above quotations, Bingham's Schol. Hist. Lay-Baptism. It is plain, then, that, according to Augustine, the validity of baptism does not depend at all upon the administrator. From that time to the period of the Reformation, this was the universal opinion in the Romish Church. About A. D. 1100, it was even decreed that if any one, heretic, Jew, or infidel, baptized in the name of the Trinity, it was to be esteemed valid. At the Reformation, the Council of Trent decreed that it was however necessary, that the administrators should intend to give what the church gives, i. e. true Christian baptism. Dens' Theo. de Sacra. N. 39, 1. This, however, was only to enable them to pronounce the baptisms of Lutherans, Calvinists and other Protestants, invalid (de Bap. N. 37, 2). The doctrine of that church still remains—" *Minister necessitatis est quilibet homo cujuscunque sexûs vel religionis*" (de Bap. N. 12, 4). The Greek Church in its zeal against Rome has generally adopted more rigid opinions.

At the time of the Reformation, principles were ad-

vanced in the discussions so common, as to the validity of lay-baptism, which apply equally to the case in hand. It was then settled to be the doctrine of the Church of England, that "the minister is not esteemed an essential part of the sacrament." *Ecc. Court, 1841; Mustin v. Escott.* Bilson, Archbishop of Winchester, declared that it was a rule agreed upon by divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament. "I withstand," says Archbishop Whitgift, "this error, that the substance and being of the sacraments dependeth upon man in any respect." "Baptism administered by heretical ministers, which be no members of the church, is notwithstanding good and effectual."

The Mennonites or German Baptists, who arose at the time of the Reformation, divided into two classes—the Waterlandians and the Flemings, or Flandrians. The former "do not baptize such as were baptized at adult years in other denominations." The latter "rebaptized not only those who had been baptized in their infancy, but likewise such as received it in adult years in the Church of Rome, or other denominations." They seem to have been an ill-instructed body of people, who even repeated the baptism of those who came to them from other branches of their own denomination. Their views can afford us little instruction, except as a warning. These practices have however been abandoned more than a century, and the modern Mennonites declare of themselves with satisfaction, that "anabaptism has become wholly obsolete, and for many years past no person of any sect whatsoever that holds the Christian faith, if baptized according to the command of Christ, i. e. on a profession of faith, is rebaptized when he wishes to join our churches" from other sects.

In England this subject was much discussed, at the rise of the Baptists as a distinct sect in 1606. The question was, Is it necessary to the validity of the sacraments, that they be handed down to us in unbroken succession? This the Romanists preached. There were, however, numerous Baptists who had been immersed by pious Independent and Episcopal ministers, and had been numbers of them ever since the time of Wickliffe. These now came out and united themselves into Baptist churches.

Not a single instance is to be met with of such being re-baptized.

The first Baptist Church in London was formed thus. Mr. Smyth, an Independent minister, while in Holland embraced Baptist sentiments, and did not think it essential to baptism that there should be any administrator at all. He is charged with baptizing himself, and at all events defends such a course.

Mr. Smyth baptized Mr. Helwisse, who went to London and established the first Baptist Church in that city. The Baptists were charged with all springing from an Arminian source. This is a mistake, however. Ivimey's *Hist. Eng. Baptists*, vol. 1, p. 118.

In 1633, an Independent Church "had grown very numerous;" and, as a number of the members did not believe in infant baptism, they requested and received liberty to form a new church on these principles; this was the second Baptist Church formed in London. "There is some obscurity," says Ivimey, (vol. 1, p. 141,) "respecting the manner in which the ancient immersion of adults . . . was restored."

The lawfulness of baptisms received from Pædobaptist pastors was a question which, though it did not trouble this particular church, of which Mr. Spilsbury was the pastor, "not a little perplexed" the Baptists in the country generally.

"They were divided in their opinions how to act in this matter, so as not to be guilty of any disorder or self-contradiction. Some indeed were of the opinion, that the first administrator should baptize himself, and then proceed to the baptizing of others. Others were for sending to those foreign Protestants that had used immersion for some time, that so they might receive it from them. And others again thought it unnecessary to baptism that the administrator be himself baptized, at least in an extraordinary case; but that whoever saw such a reformation necessary, might from the authority of Scripture lawfully begin it." Crosby's *Hist.* vol. 1, p. 97.

"In a vindication of the Baptists of London, published in 1615, however, the ground is taken, that 'all baptism received either in the Church of Rome or England is invalid; because received in a false church and from anti-Christian ministers.'" Crosby, vol. 1, p. 273.

A Mr. Richard Blount, also, was sent over by a few Baptists to the Netherlands to receive baptism, for the

sake of having a regularly authorized administrator. On this, however, Crosby remarks—

“ But the greatest number of the English Baptists and the more judicious, esteemed all this but needless trouble, and what proceeded from the old Popish doctrine of a right to administer ordinances by an uninterrupted succession, which neither the Church of Rome, nor the Church of England, much less the modern dissenters, could show to be with them. They affirmed, therefore, and practised accordingly, that after a general corruption of baptism, an unbaptized person might warrantably baptize, and so begin a reformation.”

It is clearly shown that Mr. Spilsbury and his church had nothing to do with sending over to Holland for baptism; and Ivimey concludes that it was done by only “a few people, rather than the Baptists in general.” Vol. 1, p. 143. None seem to have thought the baptism of those who would not send over to Holland invalid, but lived in fraternity with them, and received their members without rebaptism. Both Crosby and Ivimey approve the course of those who did “not adopt the old Popish notion of a right to administer ordinances by an uninterrupted succession.” The latter quotes a case supposed by Zanchy, in which a Turk comes to the knowledge of Christ by reading the New Testament, and teaches his family and converts others; but, being in a country where he cannot meet with Christian churches, may he baptize them, himself being unbaptized? “I doubt not he may,” answers Zanchy, “and withal provide that he himself be baptized by one of those converted by him.”

Upon the whole, therefore, the opinion and practice of the English Baptist churches has been that baptism, administered in the name of the Trinity and on a profession of faith by an administrator not properly baptized, although irregular and to be avoided, in ordinary circumstances, is not to be repeated.

A view of the opinions of American Baptists to about the year 1800, will complete the historical part of this discussion.

In the land where Roger Williams was himself baptized by Mr. Holliman, an unbaptized layman, it would seem particularly inappropriate to make the validity of this ordinance depend upon the qualifications of the administrator. All our historians and writers have admitted

and defended the validity of this baptism, especially Benedict and Knowles; to the latter of whom, particularly, the reader is referred. But it is impossible to vindicate this case, without admitting that a properly qualified administrator is not an essential part of valid baptism. It has indeed been sometimes incautiously said, that inasmuch as Mr. Holliman was appointed to do this by the church, it was valid; but the few believers who approved of this course were not then baptized, and consequently no Baptist church at all. Or else, if the unbaptized may authorize others, they may baptize themselves; for they can give no powers they do not possess. Or, if it is said that as a church they possessed a power which no one of them enjoyed separately, then, for the same reason, the baptism authorized by a Methodist or Presbyterian church would be proper. And plainly, if a church without baptism may commission to baptize, a Pædobaptist minister, who has at least as much right essentially and more by our customs, to be considered a minister than they have to be considered a church, can baptize.

The proper ground, however, upon which the baptism of Roger Williams is to be defended is, that this was a case of urgent necessity. This is a sufficient reason, and vindicates not only the validity, but the propriety of the act. In arguing with a Roman Catholic or a Puseyite, the case already cited from St. Augustine would sustain this. But then this reason will only have weight, upon the supposition that the character of the administrator is "not essential to the being of the sacrament, only its well being;" for if it were, it could not be valid without it. The plea of urgent necessity is a good one, the only one that could rescue such a case from the charge of great indecorum. But then it naturally follows that there is a greater necessity for admitting the validity of such irregularities after they are done, than there can be for doing them.

We have examined the Confessions of Faith of hundreds, perhaps thousands of our churches; but in no one of them down to the year 1800, can we find that baptism is rendered invalid by the want of proper qualifications in the administrator.

Generally, no mention whatever is made of the minister. Their definition is that baptism is the immersion of a believer in water, in the name of the Trinity, on a credible profession of faith. If upon the character of the administrator depends the validity of the ordinance, a new and qualifying clause must be inserted in all our works, i. e. that this immersion, to be valid baptism, must be only performed by a person who shall have been regularly baptized by some one who had a baptism handed down to him in an unbroken succession from the times of the apostles.

Some of the earlier Confessions say, that one regularly baptized and ordained is alone properly qualified to administer baptism; though even this has been for the most part omitted in later Confessions. The Kehukee Association says in its Confession of Faith, "We believe that no minister has a right to administer the ordinances, only such as are regularly called and come under the imposition of hands of the Presbytery." It was afterwards asked, "Is the baptism of a believer a legal baptism, if performed by an unauthorized minister?" Answer—"It is our opinion that the person who administered the baptism was very much out of his duty, and displeasure ought to be shown to such a practice; but as to the persons baptized, as it was done in faith, we esteem it legal."

The Confession of Faith adopted by the Philadelphia and Charleston Associations, from that of the English Baptists of 1689, in treating of the administration of the ordinances, instructs the churches and ministers that these holy appointments "are to be administered only by those who are qualified and thereunto called, according to the commission of Christ,"—as does the confession we have before quoted. Nowhere, however, does it say of the qualification of the administrator, what it does of immersion, that it "is necessary to the due administration of this ordinance." Indeed, in defining what baptism is, while it speaks of the profession of faith and of the water "wherein the party is to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," the administrator is not once alluded to.

We glance now for a moment at the opinions expressed by Baptist Associations on this point. Perhaps the fact that it has been so often discussed proves that it is rather

considered a matter of propriety, than validity—that it is not made essential to baptism in our articles of faith.

The decision of the Kehukee Association we have seen. The Ketocton (Virginia) Association, in 1791, is the only one we have been able to meet with up to 1800, which has decided that such baptisms were to be repeated as invalid.* On this case Semple remarks—“The question has been before most of the Associations at one time or other, and in every other instance they either deemed it unnecessary to baptize, or left it to the conscience of the party to be rebaptized or not.” Mr. Broaddus remarks on it, “I grant, sir, that if a man has not been immersed, he may immerse others; and his neglect of duty may not disqualify him from assisting others in the discharge of theirs.” *Hist. Virginia Bap.* p. 303. In 1809, the Richmond Association decided against the validity of baptisms by unbaptized administrators, on which Benedict remarks, vol. 2, p. 473—“Within a few years past, the question has been often proposed, and most of our Associations have decided differently from this. . . . It is difficult to conceive why they would not, in that case, come under the denomination of Anabaptists.”

Upon the whole, therefore, after patiently examining the history of opinions upon this subject, it seems difficult to conceive how testimony could be more decisive and universal upon any point at all controverted, whether we look at the times of the early Fathers, the Protestant denominations generally, or the German, English and American Baptists. All this history shows that the proper qualification of the administrator is not essential to the validity of baptism. The attempts which have occasionally been made to establish any opposite rule, from the time of Cyprian of old to that of two small Associations in this country, have been abortive, and by all our impartial historical writers protested against as innovations.

It will be proper now to examine the reasons upon which this opinion seems to be founded.

1. The general tenor of Scripture. All that has been advanced from the word of God in a previous page, as to the validity of lay-baptism, tends generally to show that

* Perhaps the Philadelphia Association also did so in 1788.

the qualification of the administrator is not essential to the validity of the baptism. But beyond this, there seems to be a singular fear and jealousy manifested throughout the New Testament, lest we should attach importance to the minister of this ordinance. Why else is it so carefully recorded, "that Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples?" Was it not that the intuitive mind of our Saviour foresaw that after Christianity was established, men would pride themselves on the superiority of a baptism received from his hands, making its efficacy depend upon its administrator, rather than its being the act of their own personal faith, the thing which alone makes ordinances acceptable under the gospel dispensation? After the ascension of the Saviour, the apostles seem as much as possible to have avoided baptizing themselves on this account. We are told of Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost, but are not told that either he or any of the apostles baptized, and there are grounds for doubting, if they did; for upon a similar occasion, the conversion of the household of Cornelius, Peter seems to make use of "certain brethren" who had accompanied him from Joppa; and though the occasion was so important, these being the first Gentile converts to Christianity, and Peter having been sent by a message from heaven, he declined himself to induct them into the Christian church, but "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Ananias, of whom we read but once, and then only as "a certain disciple," is, by the divine arrangement, the minister of baptism to St. Paul; while Philip, the deacon, immerses the Ethiopian eunuch. The reason for these precautions is obvious, when we consider the known fact that there was, on the one hand, a disposition among the converts to make the worthiness of their baptism much depend on those from whom it was derived, and on the part of the apostles, a vigorous determination to resist this dangerous delusion. For this purpose St. Paul calls to his aid the most energetic language, and says to the Corinthians, "I thank God I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius." And lest this should seem merely of accident and not of design, he attributes it to a settled and uniform system, a law of direct divine authority, which makes the administration of baptism

quite an inferior matter; "for," says he, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel."

The spirit of Christianity upon the question of an authorized administrator may well be gathered from the remarks of Jesus on the man who cast out devils in his name without commission from him. He would have his disciples "forbid him not." The faith of the recipient in the name of Jesus prevailed over the unclean spirits. Unquestionably, the authority to work miracles was of a much higher character than that to baptize; and if the superior blessings were bestowed upon the faithful recipient, though the minister of it was wholly unauthorized, how much rather shall the blessings of baptism not be withheld, when performed in the name of the Trinity and received with a lively faith.

It is not necessary to argue inferentially upon a subject as to which it can be shown, we think, that there is a direct divine command. Both Matthew and Mark record our Saviour's final commission; but there is a slight difference between the language of the two; and it has been conjectured that having been delivered once to the eleven in Jerusalem as they sat at meat (Mark. 16: 14), it was repeated on one of the mountains of Galilee (Matt. 28: 16). In the latter commission, the Saviour lays down the law of baptism as it applies to the administrator; but in the former, only to the recipient;—"he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Here, therefore, is a plain command, binding on every man when he becomes a believer, to "be baptized."* The apostle, passing to and fro, in going "into all the world," would doubtless often leave these heavenly words, buried in the hearts of some whom they addressed. These would afterwards become believers, and then the command to "be baptized" would reverberate in their ears. But they would not know where to meet with a baptized administrator. In that case, would not their commission form a direct authority for the first of them to receive this ordinance from the

* The Scripture seems to prefer this mode of speech. Peter does not say, "repent and I will baptize you," but "repent and be baptized." So Ananias to St. Paul, "Arise and be baptized," "What doth hinder me to be baptized," "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest"—showing that they attached a greater importance to the believer's submitting himself to the ordinance, than to the administrator in performing it.

hands of one unbaptized? If we suppose the contrary of this, must we not also believe that the command to believe the gospel is in no case binding, except under duly authorized teachers? And would not the command to the one to be baptized be, in that case, a commission to any believer in the authority of Jesus, though unbaptized, to baptize him? It is not impossible that our blessed Saviour repeated, at a distinct time and place, a commission the same in substance, and differing only on this one point, keeping distinct and reserving until last, the authorizing of his apostles to show that the command to be baptized was quite independent of the regular qualification of the administrator.

2. Whoever considers the spiritual nature of Christianity, must perceive that grace is a much more requisite qualification in the administrator of its ordinances, than even baptism. It is much more important that he should not be lacking in piety, than in the profession of piety; that he should have the heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, than the body washed with pure water, if choice must be made. In other ordinances of the sanctuary, this is by all admitted; and as it would be preferable to sit under the ministry of a pious Pædobaptist rather than of an unholy minister, however regular his outward qualifications, so to receive baptism at his hand. Piety is the chief thing. Evangelical truth is first; ecclesiastical order, second. But all admit the baptism of an unworthy, though regular minister; much more then must we allow that administered by a pious Pædobaptist.

If it be urged that ceremonial qualifications are more important in matters of ceremony, as spiritual qualifications are in matters of spiritual guidance, it must be replied that the great object of an administrator at all in baptism is that he may act as a spiritual guide, by ascertaining who are fit subjects for this ordinance, may encourage the timid and check the presumptuous.

Or if it should be thought that the one is so much more easily ascertained than the other—the baptism, than the conversion of the administrator—this objection must also fall to the ground. For it would be necessary for each candidate to ascertain that his minister was in all points duly baptized; and not only so, but that his ad-

ministrator was before him, and his before him. No easy task this.

If now it should be supposed, as some have done, that not only the credible profession of piety, but actual faith, were essential to valid baptism, the difficulty is still further increased. Then it would not be enough that the administrator of our baptism should have been baptized by one duly qualified, and not enough that he be now truly pious, but, unless he was at the time of his baptism, and unless all his predecessors were from the times of the apostles, our baptisms are null and void. Such difficulties must attend making the validity of baptism depend upon that of the administrator.

3. This leads us to remark upon the doctrine of an uninterrupted succession of administrators, which is necessarily involved, if, contrary to all antiquity, we make the minister an essential part of the ordinance. That there have in all ages been bodies of Christians who have maintained the views that we do upon the ordinance of baptism can be well substantiated from ecclesiastical history. But that we can demonstrate an unbroken succession, is more than is essential to maintain the truth of our principles. That we cannot, Andrew Fuller (*Works*, vol. 2, p. 661), Jones, Benedict, Knowles, Robinson, all agree. The latter says, "The doctrine of uninterrupted succession is necessary to such Christians as regulate their faith and practice by tradition, and for such it was first invented." *Eccl. Researches*, p. 746.

In this country, at least, any hope of such an "endless genealogy" must be abandoned. Supposing it were certain that, except the baptisms of the first church in Providence and those derived from that source, all had been handed down in a regular and unbroken line. Still, what probability would a person now have of being regularly baptized, if a succession were necessary? Holliman, who baptized Roger Williams and was then baptized by him, was soon after "chosen assistant to him;" Benedict 1, p. 475, 477. Then "he became a preacher;" Knowles, p. 168, and, of course, baptized largely. Mr. Brown, who fled to Rhode Island from Massachusetts, was baptized by either Holliman or Roger Williams, and became the minister of that church. His colleague, Mr. Wickenden, also came from Massachusetts, and was baptized here

from the same irregular source in 1639. These two pastors succeeded Roger Williams, and no foreign minister arrived till 1643. One of these remained to a very old age pastor of that church, and doubtless baptized multitudes. How many ministers have sprung from that church, it is now impossible to tell. Benedict gives a list of more than twelve of the most distinguished, besides those mentioned.

But this is not all. Dr. Clark fled from Massachusetts, probably in 1639, and became a "Baptist by means of Roger Williams." Benedict, vol. 1, p. 495. He founded the Baptist Church in Newport, Rhode Island, and continued its pastor thirty-two years. It is impossible to tell how many, or even how many who became ministers, he baptized in that period; but it is almost certain he baptized Obadiah Holmes, also from Massachusetts, and who afterwards was pastor of the church in Swansea, Mass. Holmes was also quite a missionary, and founded many churches, as far south as New Jersey. Here are the three first Baptist churches in this country and their ministers. Such was their baptism—all from Roger Williams or Holliman. Ministers and members from them are scattered all over the United States—all over the known world.

But the most of those who have brought baptism from foreign parts, especially from England, have also had their succession broken. What hope of an uninterrupted succession of baptized believers can remain in any one's mind? These facts are enough, surely, to prove that the doctrine of the Baptists ever has been, is, and ought to be, for consistency's sake, that a baptism may be valid—and even proper, in cases of necessity, though administered by one unbaptized.

Is it urged that at least the subject should not have reason to think or know that the administrator was not baptized? Most true, in ordinary cases, and the contrary practice should be carefully avoided, and discountenanced as highly irregular. But to make its validity depend on that, would concede the dangerous principle that the validity of baptism depended upon our esteeming it so, a principle upon which all Pædobaptists might be regarded as baptized.

To make the due qualification of the administrator essential to the validity of the ordinance of baptism, would

be inconsistent with our principles and practices—fatal to the very existence of our churches. We smile at the self-complacency of the high churchman, who despises all who do not, like himself, claim an unbroken succession from apostolic times. But such a principle would be more strange. The churchman at least thinks he can establish his unbroken descent; but what Baptist can pretend to more than a remote possibility of his? The ultra Episcopalian unchurches all others; but this idea must lead Baptists to unbaptize nine tenths of themselves!

VI. The principles just established will assist us in considering the validity of baptism administered by excommunicated ministers.

This is always, of course, to be regarded as unauthorized baptism, and as such to be discountenanced; but inasmuch as the minister, we have seen, is not an essential part of the ordinance, its validity must depend on the particular circumstances of the case. We depose and exclude for errors of doctrine or of conduct. If a minister should be excluded on either of these grounds, but afterwards in some place where his exclusion was not known, exhibiting false credentials, should preach an orthodox faith and baptize into a profession of it, the baptism may be esteemed valid, inasmuch as the recipient witnessed in it a good confession. If, however, the administrator openly preach heterodox opinions, for which he has been silenced, if they are of a fundamental character, such as denying the doctrine of the Trinity, or atonement, or regeneration, and the party is baptized plainly into such a faith of which the avowed sentiments of the minister would ordinarily be an evidence, his baptism would be no profession of true Christianity, and invalid upon principles before laid down in section II. of these remarks. If, however, the errors which the minister professes were upon minor points, such as mixed communion, or nice questions of the Arminian and Calvinistic controversy, then, if the baptized person desires to join one of our churches, he ought of course to disavow or renounce the errors of his former communion; but as baptism is a profession of faith only in the fundamental principles of Christianity, and as many other points are distinctly left in the commission to be taught after baptism, his having erroneous views on them, or no views at all, would not invalidate his baptism.

And though it may be clear that the minister may have been justly silenced as a contumacious schismatic, it is not to be presumed that a young Christian just come to the knowledge of the truth, could accurately discover at once the errors of one who was, perhaps, the means of bringing him to the knowledge of the truth. Such, clearly, were the precise views of the ancient church, and such has been the usual decision of considerate bodies in our own denomination (see Minutes of the Charleston Asso., in the case of Palmer. 'a disorderly person'). Where the minister should have joined another evangelical denomination, the Free-Will Baptists, for instance, the propriety of this course would be still more clear. If to this it should be objected that it would often countenance an excluded member who is a schismatic, and perhaps busily opposing the truth, it may be replied that in demanding a renunciation of the error, you remove, so far as the member is concerned, all the cause and countenance of schism. You could demand no more of the minister. Nor is the authority of the administrator even conceded.

If a minister be excluded for wicked conduct, and it were to be known, acknowledged and defended, so that he were to maintain that there was no necessity for moral conduct, were to practice and defend, we will say a community of wives, any persons baptized into that faith could not be esteemed Christians—such baptism would not be a confession of fundamental faith, and no hesitation should be felt in repeating it.

There have, however, sometimes arisen cases which must not be confounded with this, in which a minister is excluded for immorality—the cause is known, but either denied, or some partial confession made, so that the man is upheld by a large party, though such immorality would not in itself be upheld or tolerated. In a Southern city, a minister of high standing in another denomination was accused of intemperance, and beyond doubt guilty; he made some unsatisfactory excuse or partial confession, and was suspended from the ministry; a large portion of his people thought him hardly treated, and formed a church. Independent of others, he administered ordinances, though deposed. That church, one of the largest, wealthiest, and most flourishing in the South, has ever

since remained alone. All its baptisms have, however, been esteemed valid by the denomination to which the minister originally belonged. The same thing has occurred in our own denomination, and the same manner of treating it should be adopted. For the doctrine preached being good may be the means of true conversions, and young converts cannot always be judges of the propriety of the conduct of those who are the means of their conversion.

Closely connected with this, baptism in excluded churches demands a remark or two. If the churches were excluded for errors of a fundamental character, the parties who may have joined them from the world should be rebaptized,—as when in the West, any of our churches have become Campbellite, whose baptism is not a profession of faith in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. But it will sometimes happen that three fourths or nine tenths of a church, following some favorite minister in his errors, will change their doctrine in some points, which, though important to church order, cannot be esteemed fundamental. In such case, it has been the custom for the adhering party, however small, to meet and withdraw themselves from the rest; after which, the Association will receive the minority as the church, and refuse admission to the delegates sent from the heretical majority. Instances have been known, in which the same movement has occurred simultaneously in several churches, and the erroneous majorities have formed a new association of their own. We have known one case of this kind, in which the majorities in nine or ten churches, becoming Arminian and in favor of mixed communion, the minorities retired, and the rest formed a new association. Their ministers proceeded to baptize, and to ordain others who baptized several hundreds. In process of time, the whole association abandoned mixed communion and adopted the Baptist articles of faith mentioned in the *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*, and which had recently been adopted by several associations of regular Baptists around them. If from removals or other causes the members of any of these churches, baptized among them, should be desirous of joining regular churches, or if the whole association were to desire to become fully one with their old brethren, it would be a highly important question whether those who have re-

ceived baptism in these separated churches should all be rebaptized. To us it seems clear that they should not. For whatever contumacy may have been manifested by the seceders in leaving the regular Baptists, was manifested before the new converts were added to them, and they may have been ignorant of it. They should be treated, therefore, just as errorists of the same character would be,—Free-will Baptists, for instance.

It is doubtful if they could be considered excommunicated bodies at all. For a church is the only body on earth that can depose a minister or excommunicate members. Nor can the minority of a church excommunicate, against the wishes of the majority. For the majority either are members or they are not. If not, they cannot be excommunicated; if they are, they can outvote the others. For each would be competent to vote, except upon his own individual case. Any other plan would involve endless difficulties, putting into the power of a minority, however small, whenever they deemed it right, to excommunicate the majority or depose ministers—no one would be safe.

The minority can withdraw, can declare the others a schismatical or heretical church, but not excommunicate, if by this is meant unchurching them. So that an association of this kind is to be regarded and treated as in fact a different denomination; and their ministers and members, as ministers and members of a church of a different faith, but still of a church of baptized believers. The minority are not injured by such a course, and the opinions of a majority seem entitled to this respect. It is believed that in the case which has been referred to, the association to which these seceders formerly belonged, without any church action, declared and published the ministers and members seceding as excommunicated. This has also been done once in the Virginia Association. But these are dangerous precedents, which, if carried out, would destroy church independence. An association is only an advisory body. It is true, it may debar either individuals or churches, on just and constitutional grounds, from the peculiar privileges of its association; but it cannot unchurch a church, or excommunicate an individual, or depose a minister. At the present day, when our churches are associated in large bodies in various ways for useful

purposes, it is highly important that strict adherence to the principles of church independence should be maintained.

We cannot close these remarks without adding a word to show the importance of baptism not being repeated unnecessarily. There is, perhaps, an increasing tendency amongst us to fall into an error here. To make baptism not a simple profession of personal faith in the fundamental principles of Christianity, which was the design of its founder, but of a matured and perfect similarity of faith and practice upon all conceivable questions of theology. And if ever the Baptists as a body should be found to place an excessive and superstitious value on this, the outward part of baptism, we venture to say, it will be first indicated by their tithing its mint and cummin. Our sentiments as Baptists are not only true, but plainly true—easily proved so—they are important, they have had, and are having most important effects upon the whole Christian world—they are undervalued by other Christians, and yet we are attacked for them on every side, and it has cost us much to maintain them. They are daily triumphing over all obstacles. In such circumstances, a rigid attachment to every iota of the ground covered by our principles is natural and proper. There may, however, be some danger of rashly taking up a more advanced position. In one of the greatest battles of modern times, the squares of the attacked army, impatient of merely repelling the enemy, inch by inch, imperceptibly advanced to meet them, until the whole front of the battle was changed, and in consequence the victory which they afterwards gained, for a time was endangered. And if the triumph of Baptist principles should ever for a moment be suspended or in danger, we venture to predict that it will be from their departing from the dignified simplicity of their original position, and in the zeal of meeting their opponents, advancing to new ground. Every thing which makes baptism depend for validity upon the qualifications of the administrator, by so much lessens its value as an act of personal faith, does away with its simplicity, and makes its worthiness contingent on a thousand obscure circumstances, instead of broad general principles. It introduces endless doubts and complications into the whole subject, puts a ceremonial yoke upon our necks

more intolerable than the Jewish, and such as none have ever been able to bear.*

Nothing will so effectually deter others from embracing our views, as unsettled or erroneous practices becoming common on this subject. For if our opponents can prove wrong upon us in regard to the very ordinance on which we profess to set them right, they will bid us take the beam out of our own eye, ere we remove the mote from theirs. It will be in vain for us to plead that this is at most but a trifling error. They will be satisfied to urge that "if they are wrong in sprinkling, we are in rebaptizing."

Above all, such a course is contrary to the principles of the true Christian catholicity. In so spiritual a religion as Christianity, the tendency of our minds should be, as far as possible, in favor of the validity of baptism; and it has, therefore, ever been considered by all Christians as highly improper to repeat baptism, without the most ample cause and urgent necessity. As Baptists this care is doubly incumbent upon us, that we may avoid all just ground for the charge of being Anabaptists, while we exhibit amongst ourselves the strange spectacle of having "one Lord, one faith, but two baptisms!"—or, by unwarrantably using the name of the Trinity, trifle with these words of Scripture, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

T. F. C.

* R. Williams, for instance, after a few months, left the Baptists and abandoned all churches, thinking "the visible church extinct," on these grounds. See his life by Knowles, and Benedict's Hist. Baptists.

ARTICLE IV.

LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, *before the Lowell Institute, January, 1844.* By MARK HOPKINS, D. D., President of Williams College. Boston. T. R. Marvin. 1846. pp. 383, 8vo.

BY THE EDITOR.

FEW topics furnish a fairer field for the display of genius than the Evidences of Christianity. Strong minds and able pens have been enlisted in showing that the bulwarks of our faith are impregnable. Not only fervent Christians, but also men destitute of the spirit of Christ and strangers to vital godliness, have contended for Christianity with distinguished success. The argument for Christianity is well adapted to strike the attention of thinking minds. Men who know how to appreciate a convincing demonstration, find in it something to be admired. The truth and divine authority of our religion comes to us so fully attested, and capable of being shown in so many different ways, that no theorem in mathematics can boast of a more satisfactory proof. By several different systems of argument, by various lines of testimony, we find ourselves brought continually to the same conclusions. If the external testimony were absent, we have the immovable bulwark of the internal. If direct proof were wanting, we have an astonishing mass of that which is inferential. If the record of the miracles could be blotted out, we have history; even profane history could not be written, without recognizing the existence, the influence and the principles of Christianity. If the doctrines were taken away, the rites of Christianity would remain to be accounted for; these are fixed facts in the history of the world; in their own nature, they speak forth a system of revealed truth; they embrace certain doctrines which they recognize, and which are the doctrines of Christianity. If doctrines and rites were removed, history and memory, the Scriptures, and all our Christian literature, both ancient and modern,

it would still be evident that an element has entered into our civilization which was unknown to the civilizations of Greece and Rome, as well as of all parts of the eastern world; and that element must necessarily be traced, in the end, to the refining and elevating force of Christianity. It is true that there is much in our Christian countries and under the shadow of our Christian institutions, worthy only of Vandal barbarism and the most degraded forms of savage uncivilization; but there is also a taste of something higher. A humanizing influence has evidently hovered over the face of society. The breath of some messenger of peace has breathed over the fiery abyss of human passion, and wrought a transformation upon human selfishness. There are to be found among us traits of human loveliness, dignity and generosity, as well as of piety, such as the best days of Rome and Greece never conceived of, and which must have had some origin. And no theory can account for these things, unless Christianity be allowed as the chief element—the saving Spirit, moving on the face of the waters—the forming genius, molding the refractory forms of human character after a heavenly model—the celestial gravitation, attracting free spirits upward to their proper centre and source.

The subject of the Evidences of Christianity is one not quickly exhausted. Successive periods of the world bring to light new testimonies in its favor. New discoveries remove difficulties out of the way. Science and the progress of the human race, the progress of the gospel and the fresh developments of Christianity, prove that “we have not followed cunningly devised fables.” Whatever be a man’s taste, and whatever the nature of his literary pursuits, he is likely to find something here to interest him. Whatever modes of proof seem to a person most satisfactory, he can apply them to Christianity; and, unless they be of a nature wholly aside from the nature of the subject, so that it would be absurd to propose them, Christianity will not refuse to give testimony concerning itself. It will not shrink from any reasonable tests. When questioned, it will give a satisfactory reply. Like a citadel of ancient times, it is found to be secure in every part. Its foundations are sunk deeply in the earth, so that neither frosts can heave them out of their place, nor rains trickle among their crevices and weaken them, nor

an invading foe undermine them, and insinuate his forces from beneath into the fortress. The stones of its massive walls are so heavy that human art cannot move them to throw them down. They are joined together with an imperishable cement, and fastened with heavy clamps of iron so that not one can be started from its place. The whole structure is made to form one compact body. The buttresses stand thickly together, so that no battering ram could act upon the walls; and the deep, wide moat in front, forbids the approach of warlike enginery. Its towers are high and strong. And, as befits such a structure, it is filled with armed men, whose weapons are polished and of celestial temper. The storms beat around it, but it is not shaken. The thunders rumble through its arches and the lightnings play around its summit; but he who makes the clouds his chariot and who rides on the wings of the wind, and whom all the elements obey, preserves it from their fury. The seasons come and go, shedding around it their glow and their gloom, their blossoms and their ripened fruits. Noonday pours upon it its fierce beams, and morning and evening make it the measure of their shadows. Ages pursue their circling course, and generation after generation gazes on it, passes away, and is forgotten. The tide of time, in its ebb and flow, dashes against its sides, and the waves of duration die at its foot. Such is Christianity. So firm are its towers, so secure its palaces. "God is known in the midst of her for a refuge." "Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof."

We are gratified that this topic, though so nearly connected with the office of the pulpit, is not left exclusively to its charge. We rejoice to see it introduced, in the present instance, into a course of scientific lectures. It is worthy of the benevolence in which the Lowell Lectures originated, worthy of the speaker, and worthy of the public. President Hopkins has honored the foundation by which the Lectures are supported—a legitimate product of Christian refinement and charity. Such an institution has never graced a land without the gospel. He honored his auditory, by judging that they would deem such a discussion not out of place nor uninteresting. And

he has honored himself by the ability with which he has presented the arguments for the divine authority of Christianity. He has not trodden altogether in a beaten track; but has shown that he is worthy to lay claim to the honor of an original and independent writer.

We propose to exhibit the course of thought pursued by the President in his Lectures, adding such remarks as seem to us appropriate under the several heads. In a sceptical age, it is wise often to refresh our minds by recurring to an analysis of the Evidences of Christianity.

Before proceeding, however, it is due to the publisher to say, that the mechanical execution of the work is very pleasing,—the page being large, the type generous and clear, and the paper firm and pure. It is very attractive to the eye, and a fine specimen of the present advanced state of the typographical art. It is written in a style easy and readable, not profuse in ornament, not unnecessarily bold; but such as well befits the subject and the occasion. The work is creditable both to the logical ability and the literary taste of the author.

The subject is presented in twelve Lectures. The first and second consist of preliminary considerations, with the definition of terms, and removal of difficulties. The third treats of internal and external evidence, showing the difference between them, and the claims of the former to a prior exhibition. Lectures IV–VIII contain a view of the internal evidences; IX–XI, the external evidences. The whole closes in Lecture XII, with a brief answer to objections, and the consideration of additional particulars, tending to show the truth and divinity of the Christian system.

At the commencement, the author remarks that he hopes, by these lectures, to benefit three classes of persons; those who have received Christianity by acquiescence, having never examined its claims; those who have passed from this class into doubt and infidelity, and Christians themselves. He then shows that the kind of evidence by which Christianity is supported is satisfactory;—that it is adapted to produce conviction in a candid mind;—and that it has as much certainty as mathematical demonstration. We may arrive at certainty in respect to any subject of investigation on six different grounds. The grounds of certainty are reason, or the Reason, con-

sciousness, the evidence of the senses, memory, testimony and reasoning. The evidence of the divine authority of Christianity rests on the last two; and if the proofs arising from either one of them are sufficient to give entire certainty, *a fortiori* the proofs arising from both must be so.

But may not testimony and reasoning clash? May not a person or a number of persons affirm that a certain thing happened, which reasoning shows to be unnatural, unlikely, and contrary to universal experience? This is the difficulty started by Hume, in his celebrated argument against miracles. The author, therefore, at this point takes occasion to present an extended reply to Mr. Hume; and vindicates the Christian miracles in an able and triumphant manner. As we have in this refutation a good specimen of the style and manner of the author, and of the ability with which he stands up for the truth, we quote what he says on this point, at length.

“Hume takes it for granted that what we call a miracle is contrary to the uniformity of nature. Indeed, his own definition of a miracle is, that it is a violation of the laws of nature. But how can we know that what we call a miracle is not, in the highest and most proper sense, as natural as any other event? By the term *natural*, we mean stated, fixed, uniform. Whatever happens statedly in given circumstances, we call natural. If men rose from the dead as statedly, after a year, as they now do from sleep in the morning, one would be as natural as the other, and would occasion no more surprise. In accordance with this definition, we call an event natural, though it happen but once in a thousand years, provided it come round statedly at the end of that time. The appearance of a comet having the periodical time of a thousand years, would be just as natural as the rising of the sun. But if we suppose such a comet to appear for the first time, and that were the only one in the system, it is plain no man could tell whether it was natural or not. When it should come round again and again, it would be considered natural.

“But who can tell whether, in the vast cycles of God’s moral government, miracles may not have been provided for, and come in, at certain distant points, as statedly and uniformly, and therefore as naturally, as any thing else? Who can tell whether a miracle may not be, to the ordinary course of events, as the occasional and momentary reversing of the engine bearing the cars onward? A man gets into a railroad car for the first time, and moves uniformly forward, perhaps for the course of a day, and he may suppose the engine capable of no other motion. He has rode a *whole* day, and has had no experience of any other. But an emergency occurs, and the motion of the engine is reversed. He now perceives that it is capable of an adjustment and a movement required only on particular occasions, of which he was before wholly ignorant. But a thousand years are with God as one

day; and it may be, it is not altogether improbable, that as the engine, and the cars, and whole material apparatus are made for the convenience and benefit of the passengers, so the mighty train of the universe, with its countless hosts of suns and stars, were made for the accommodation of the passengers that are in it; and though God may roll it forward with an uninterrupted motion for a thousand years, yet that then the emergency may occur, and that he may for a moment reverse the motion, and say, 'Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou moon, in the valley of Ajalon.' What should prevent it? What do we know of the plans and purposes of God, to enable us to say that this is impossible, especially if we suppose it demanded by the exigencies of his moral government, and the good of his sensitive and rational creation?

"But the truth is, Hume does not take the moral government of God into his account at all. This is his great mistake. It is like the mistake of the astronomer, who should carefully notice the circular movement of the planets around their primaries, but should fail to notice that mightier movement by which, as we are told, planets and suns are all borne onward towards some unknown point in infinite space. Experience may enable him to determine, and to calculate the movements of the first order; but if he would know those of the second, he must inquire of him who carries it forward. The moral government of God is a movement in a line onwards towards some grand consummation, in which the principles, indeed, are ever the same, but the developments are always new;—in which, therefore, no experience of the past can indicate with certainty what new openings of truth, what new manifestations of goodness, what new phases the moral heavens may appear.

"The difficulty with most of those who have opposed Hume has been that they have permitted him, while arguing the question ostensibly on the ground of theism, to involve positions that are really atheistic. They have permitted him to give, surreptitiously, to the mere physical laws of nature, a sacredness and a permanence which put them in the place of God. Let the question be fairly stated, and it would seem impossible there should be any difficulty respecting it. Do we believe in the existence of a personal God, intelligent and free?—not a God who is a part of nature, or a mere personification of the powers of nature, but one who is as distinct from nature, as the builder of a house is from the house? Do we either believe, with our best philosophers, that the laws of nature are only the stated mode in which this God operates, or that all nature, with all its laws, are perfectly under his control? Then we can find no difficulty that such a God may, at any time when the good of his creatures requires it, change the mode of his operation, and suspend those laws. Would Hume accept this statement of the question? If so, the dispute is at an end, for this relation of God to nature involves the possibility both of a miracle and of its proof. It is incompatible with their relation that experience should ever attain that character of absolute and necessary uniformity, in virtue of which alone its evidence can be set in opposition to that of testimony. If he would not accept this statement he is an atheist or a pantheist; and we are not yet prepared to argue the question of miracles, for that cannot be argued, until it is fully conceded that a personal God exists.

"The above seems to me a sufficient answer to the argument of Hume. It is, however, by no means the only one; and as a full discussion of it involves some collateral points that do not seem to be fully settled, I will pursue it a little farther.

"If we use the phrase, 'course of nature,' in its more restricted and usual sense, then the only possible way in which a miracle can be a violation of that course, or contrary to experience, is, that it never happened, and was never observed; for if it had happened, and had been observed, then it would constitute a part of universal experience. But to say that a violation, or, more properly, a suspension, of the laws of nature never happened because those laws are uniform, is taking for granted the very point in dispute. It is as bold and barefaced a begging of the question as can well be imagined. Suppose the question to be whether a dead man had been raised. 'No,' says Hume, 'because'—these are his own words—'it has never been witnessed in any age or country that a dead man should come to life.' Is this reasoning?

"Grant to Hume that the laws of nature are absolutely uniform, and you preclude, of course, all proof for a miracle. This is the fundamental premise, by which he attempts to show that a miracle cannot be proved by testimony; and whoever grants him this, grants the very point in dispute. The laws of nature, when it is once conceded that they are laws, are of equal authority; and it is in vain to attempt to invalidate the authority of one by bringing against it that of another, by whatever amount of induction it may have been established. This does not seem to have been perceived by Dr. Chalmers, in his very elaborate attempt to refute the argument of Hume, or rather in his attempt, while he allows that argument to have force, to overbalance it by a greater force. But the argument of Hume is either conclusive, or it is of no force whatever. How, then, does Chalmers meet it? He grants that the laws of nature are uniform, and says that there are laws of testimony, which are a part of the laws of nature, as uniform as any other, and that there are certain kinds of testimony in regard to which the uniform experience is, that they do not deceive us; and then he goes on to show, with great power, how the force of testimony may be accumulated so as to overbalance any improbability whatever. I admit fully all that he says on the force of testimony. But let its force be ever so great, if it were a fact that no testimony was ever known to deceive us, yet even then, if we admit the premise of Hume, we only balance uniform experience against uniform experience, and thus produce the very case of perplexity spoken of by him. Chalmers saw, with great clearness, the amazing force of testimony as proof. He says, in opposition to Campbell and others, that our belief in testimony is founded solely on experience, and that there are certain kinds of testimony of which we have uniform experience that they do not deceive us. But he failed to see that no uniform experience of the truth of testimony could prove a fact that had been already admitted to be contrary to 'a firm and unalterable experience.' 'A firm and unalterable experience' of the truth of testimony can never prove a fact which can be fairly shown to be contrary to another firm and unalterable experience.

"The argument of Hume implies, and Chalmers admits, this opposition of the evidence of testimony and of experience in the proof of a

miracle. I, however, admit of no such opposition, and think it easy to show that there is none. Had Hume been asked why he believed the course of nature to be absolutely uniform, he must have answered, that he believed it on the ground of experience. And then if asked how he knew what that experience had been, he must have replied, by testimony, for there is no other possible way. And thus it would appear that, while he seems to oppose the evidence of experience to that of testimony, he is only opposing the evidence of testimony to that of testimony. And what would the testimony on the side of Hume amount to in such a case? Why, absolutely nothing, because it is merely negative. Let a thousand men swear, in a court of justice, that they did not see a murder committed, and it will not diminish in the least the force of the testimony of one man who swears that he did see it, unless the thousand pretend to have been on the spot, and to have had opportunity to witness it. In this case, the experience of the thousand men would be properly said to be contrary to that of one. But in no such sense can experience be said to be contrary to the testimony for miracles. If any number of men,—if the whole race,—with the exception of those who had an opportunity to see, and who did see, a miracle, should testify that they did not see it, that would not invalidate in the least, the testimony of those who did see it. We should judge of that testimony on its own proper merits.

“Thus stands the argument, if, with Hume, we place our belief in the uniformity of nature on the ground of experience. But is this really the ground of that belief? I think not. Nor can I agree with Stewart and other metaphysicians, who place ‘the expectation of the continued uniformity of the laws of nature’ among what they call the fundamental laws of belief, which we believe is necessary and without reference to experience. This is not the place for the full discussion of this point. I merely observe, that, so far is this from being to the mind a law of belief, to the exclusion of supernatural agency, that narrations of such agency have been received in all ages, upon the slightest evidence; and that if this were the law, then no man ought to believe, or could believe, in the resurrection of the dead, or a future judgment, or in the destruction or change of the present order of nature in any way whatever. The difficulty lies in an incautious and narrow statement of the true law. The true law of belief is, that the same causes will, in the same circumstances, produce the same effects. This is the law; and when applied to the permanence or uniformity of the course of nature, it will stand thus: The present course of nature will be uniform and permanent, unless other causes than those now in operation shall intervene to interrupt or destroy it. The probability of the intervention of such causes is a point on which any man must decide for himself. To me it seems probable—to you, perhaps, improbable; but there is nothing in the nature of the case to prevent it from being proved like any other fact.

“Having thus put the question upon its true basis, it will be necessary to say very little of the particular fallacies and consequences connected with the argument of Hume. I will simply add, that,

“1. This argument proceeds on a principle which would make it unreasonable to believe a miracle on the testimony of the senses. There is precisely the same reason for opposing the evidence of experience to that

of the senses, as for opposing it to that of testimony. If the argument would overthrow a full proof from testimony, the senses certainly could give nothing more.

"2. Hume uses the term *experience* in two senses. Personal experience is the knowledge we have acquired by our own senses. General experience is that knowledge of facts which has been acquired by the race. If, therefore, Hume says a miracle is contrary to his personal experience, that proves nothing; but if he says it is opposed to universal experience, that, as has already been said, is begging the question.

"3. He opposes the evidence of experience to that of testimony, evidently with the intention of opposing to testimony the high authority that belongs to personal experience; whereas, in the sense in which he must use the term 'experience,' since, as has been said, we can know what general experience is only by testimony, he is only opposing testimony to testimony.

"4. If the argument of Hume be correct, then no evidence would be sufficient to prove a new fact in natural science, since it would be as much contrary to universal experience as a miracle.

"And, finally, Hume has himself renounced the principle of his own argument. He seems, after having written the essay, to have had a perception of some of the absurd consequences to which it must lead, and therefore adds, in a note,—'I own there may possibly be miracles of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony.' This single admission destroys at once the whole force of his argument. As an example, he says,—'Suppose all authors, in all languages, agree that, from the first of January, 1600, there was a total darkness over all the earth for eight days; suppose the tradition of this event is still strong and lively among the people; that all travellers bring us accounts of the same tradition; it is evident that our philosophers ought to receive it for certain.' 'But,' he adds, 'should this miracle be ascribed to any new system of religion, men in all ages have been so imposed upon by ridiculous stories of that kind, that the very circumstance would be full proof of a cheat, and sufficient with all men of sense, not merely to make them reject the fact, but to reject it without further examination.' On the consistency and candor of this passage, I make no comment. Who, after reading it, can fail to feel that Hume was guilty of a heartless, if not a malignant trifling with the best interests of his fellow-men?"

In his second Lecture, Pres. Hopkins shows the probability of a revelation. It is probable, 1. From the nature of the case. When we consider the character of God, the character of man, the condition and destiny of man, and the relation of man to God and to eternity, it is natural to suppose that God would probably make a revelation of himself, such as the believers in Christianity claim that he has made. A revelation is probable, 2. From facts. "If it was probable that God would do any thing to restore a race of transgressors to himself, it was in the

same degree probable that he would give a revelation different from any that nature can possibly give." Without a revelation, men are destitute even of that knowledge which it is supposed that the light of nature is able to teach. It is found that, destitute of a revelation, men are ignorant of the doctrine of the divine unity; they have no knowledge of God as a holy God, and exercising a moral government, whose principles extend to the thoughts of the heart; they are given up to idolatry; and they have no knowledge of the immortality of the soul. Still less, without a revelation, could they know whether God would pardon sin, or, if he should pardon, on what terms he would pardon it. A man could not tell whether God would regard with favor his efforts to return to the path of virtue, and aid him in his endeavors, or whether he would leave him to struggle against resisting influences without his countenance or help. The ignorance and idolatry of men would necessarily involve a state of deep degradation. Such is, in fact, the state of men without the gospel. They are given up to the unrestrained dominion of vice. They are "without God, and without hope in the world." The noblest creature of God on this terrestrial sphere, endowed with faculties which render him meet to be a companion of angels and glorious spirits, the image of his Maker's immortality, with whom God can hold communion and over whom heavenly messengers keep guardianship, who is destined, if redeemed, to shine as the sun in the firmament and as the stars forever and ever, with his boundless capacities, in their endless expansion, qualified more and more to glorify God, and to comprehend, adore and admire more and more his wisdom, goodness and power, which burst forth in living rays from every object in the universe and are reflected from every lineament of his sanctified nature—this noble being is given up, on the supposition that we have no revelation, to every thing that is low and debasing. He is sunk to a level beneath the brutes that perish, and delivered over to a thralldom the more disgusting, in proportion to his ability to rise above it. Now if we regard it probable that God would hold intercourse with man in a state of innocence, and, from what we know of his character, not improbable that he would make his mercy known in the form of a revelation, to a ruined and guilty race,

in the same manner it is not improbable that he would perform miracles, in attestation of this revelation. A miracle "is the simple, natural, majestic seal which we should expect God would affix to a communication from himself; and where this seal is presented by men whose lives and works correspond with what we might expect from messengers of God, it is felt to be decisive."

Miracles, besides being attestations to the truth, for a reflecting mind settle two other points. They prove that there is "a personal God, with a distinct will," having control over nature and its laws, and sufficiently interested in the affairs and the destiny of men to interpose in this manner for the purpose of communicating with them. They also prove, inasmuch as they are generally wrought in attestation of some moral truth, the immense superiority of God's moral, over his natural administration. The latter gives place to the former; it is made subservient to its ends, as the less to the greater. It is used as a subordinate instrument, in reference to a higher object. And a doctrine whose authority is attested by a miracle is always to be received as divine, because none but God can perform a real miracle. There may be, indeed, among men tricks of legerdemain; and we know not what power malignant spirits may occasionally be permitted to exercise over nature. But we believe that a real miracle was never wrought by any but a divine hand. He who made "great Nature's course," alone can sway it for moral ends; and he, for the accomplishment of his ends, can not only make, but suspend or reverse the operation of the laws he has made. A miracle, therefore, is God's signature to a truth or system of truths to which it is set. It is the open and authoritative proclamation of a voice from heaven. It is, in respect to the system of which it professes to be an attestation, as if he who "maketh the clouds his chariot and who rides upon the wings of the wind," who is infinite in wisdom, and who cannot lie, should appear to mortals in the gorgeous vestments of divinity, and speaking in the words of men, should say—"I, Jehovah, the living God, set to this truth my hand and seal. I ratify it by my almighty power. I receive it under my patronage, as a truth which I declare, and which I will protect and defend." Sublime, indeed, as well as condescending does Jehovah appear, in these interpositions of his power. Glory

and grace intermingle their rays, the one too bright by itself for mortal eyes to behold, the other, like the emerald round about the throne, mild and clear, and pleasant to the sight. He who dwells in light "unapproachable and full of glory, whom no man hath seen or can see," and whose moral distance from our race is increased by the debasing influence of sin,—stoops to hold intercourse with men. He comes down from heaven to commune with them. He stops, or changes the course of nature, that he may call their attention to the time, the place, the circumstances, the object, and the fact of his revealing himself to them; or, he made special provision in the original ordering of the laws of nature for the occurrence of what we term miracles, that he might make it certain to men that he has spoken unto them. He handles the mighty elements of the physical creation, uncontrollable by any human power, with consummate ease,—speaking, and it is done; commanding, and it stands fast,—that he may communicate with his creatures on terms that shall convince them that his words are divine. How unwise is it for a man to deny the possibility of miracles, when the only question is whether infinite power is competent to work them! How ungrateful to doubt them, when their only end is to seal and certify the fact of divine communications to men! How unphilosophical to cast them away, when they are so various, so numerous, so abundantly attested, so benign in their object, so worthy of a God, so far above all suspicion, so sublime, so beautiful and so divine!

This is a point on which it is profitable to linger, because it is vital to the question of the divinity of Christianity, and to the authority of the sacred books. Did God ever make a revelation of himself to man? If he did not, then the Scriptures are not a revelation of God. If miracles are the proper test of a revelation, then God has revealed himself to man; the Scriptures are the word of God, and the truths which they announce come to us with the sanction of divine authority.

The miracles recorded in the Scriptures are numerous. There was not a single demonstration of this sort, after which the wonder-working energy was withdrawn. One such event might have been liable to be doubted. Men might stand aghast, as unprepared to examine it. It

might have taken them by surprise; and, passing away like a sudden pageant, they could scarcely tell what they had seen. But the miracles which attested the revelation of God to men were not on a scale of parsimony. The history of them is scattered through the Old Testament and the New. A particular statement is given in the Scriptures of about one hundred and twenty. Besides this, the sacred history often remarks in general terms that many were healed, and the like. Of these one hundred and twenty miracles, about seventy are recorded in the Old Testament, and fifty in the New. They occurred in the various districts of Palestine, in the provinces of Asia Minor, in Chaldea, in Egypt, and in other places. They were witnessed at one time by an individual, at another by a small collection of persons, and at another by great multitudes. The miracles of the Old Testament, which may be regarded as preliminary to the revelations of the New,—as earlier links in the same chain, and as tending to the same results,—were sometimes witnessed by more than half a million men of war, besides superannuated persons, women and children.

The miracles were most various in their character. They touched upon the extremes of probability, as it were, and lingered at all the intervals. God sanctified to himself all the kingdoms of nature, for these displays of his power and glory. Fire and water, earth and air, metals and minerals, the sun and moon, the human frame, angelic messengers,—all were made to bear the seals of God's revelations of himself to men. Birds and beasts, fishes and insects, proclaimed the presence and the activity of God. All the senses of men were appealed to, and made to perceive the efficiency of his power. The range of the miracles is a striking characteristic of them. They are without any limitation. Christ, in the New Testament miracles, wrought in attestation of his divinity and Messiahship, displays a ubiquitous power which could belong to none but God. He suspends the laws of gravitation; casts out from a single devil to a whole legion; cures now a withered hand, and now a universal paralysis; gives sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb; here calms a mad demoniac, there soothes the raging sea; speaks a word, and the fig tree becomes barren, so that no man eats fruit of it thereafter; and

again, in his compassion, feeds five thousand by the miraculous multiplication of a few loaves and fishes; heals the smitten ear of the high priest's servant; raises Lazarus from the dead; and having laid down his own life, as a suffering man, after three days takes it again; bursting the bonds of death, and coming forth as a conqueror, sublimely declaring his right to be accounted the Lord of the dead and of the living. The miracles, too, were of such a character, and wrought in such a manner as to subserve the designs implied in a divine revelation. They were not secret, but open. They did not shun publicity; they were wrought sometimes in the presence of a few, as if to court a specific examination, sometimes before crowds, that all might be satisfied. Tricks of legerdemain avoid the light; they flee from investigation. They are generally sudden and startling effects, incapable of being seized, and held, and examined. Not so the miracles of the New Testament. The man born blind lives after his healing for many years, a standing monument of the power that had wrought his cure. Lazarus, after he was raised from the dead, was again present among living men. He frequented their assemblies, he worshipped in their synagogues, he was a guest at their feasts. They saw him, and talked with him, and knew that it was "he that had been dead, whom Jesus raised from the dead." The melancholy demoniac, who once wandered in gloomy solitude among the tombs, was seen by multitudes, "sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind;" and he went to his home, not a furious demon, to scatter terror in his path, but to tell his friends, "how great things Jesus had done for him." The miracles connected with divine communications have generally been marked by this character of frankness and publicity. It was eminently the case under the Old Testament dispensation. The whole court of Pharaoh saw the miracles which Moses wrought, while the king refused to let the Hebrews go. The whole land trembled under them. The whole host of the Egyptians saw the waters of the Red Sea stand up on an heap, while the people of God went through, dry shod. And the ruin of Egypt's mighty men told but too painfully to the survivors, how mighty was that wonder-working hand which brought back the rushing waters to their place. The quails and manna

came at God's bidding, not in the sight of two or three persons only, but of a whole nation. When Korah and his company were swallowed up in the earth on account of their wickedness, "all the people stood in the entering in of their tents and looked on." When the sun and the moon stood still in the time of Joshua, and "went not down for the space of a whole day," two contending armies, horsemen and footmen, saw the prodigy. And in like manner, in the time of Christ, multitudes were healed, as they thronged and pressed him; each, subject to the scrutiny of the multitudes, and of his friends. And multitudes more followed, wondering "when they saw the dumb speak, the lame walk, the blind see, the deaf hear, and the dead raised—and they glorified the God of Israel." When, therefore, infidelity, with her ignorant and blind suspicion, sneeringly asks our Christianity, "What sign showest thou, that we may see and believe thee?"—when she asks, "What proof is there that God has ever interposed for the purpose of communicating a revelation of himself to man,"—point her to the bush, that burned with fire, and was not consumed; point her to the ten plagues of Egypt, and to the watery walls of the Red Sea; point her to the hundreds of thousands whom God fed with manna in the wilderness; point her to the triple miracle, wrought with the manna every week, in honor of the Sabbath; point her to the two warlike armies, looking with amazement to see the sun and moon stand still; point her to Elijah's altar, kindled by fire from heaven, in the contest between the worshippers of Jehovah and of Baal, while the people shout with deafening harmony—"The Lord, he is the God! The Lord, he is the God!" Point her to the three holy men in the furnace of Nebuchadnezzar, walking unharmed in the midst of the fire; point her to the glorious train of Christ's mighty works; point her to the wonders wrought by the apostles,—all attested by competent witnesses; all God's mighty acts. And if there is any value in human testimony, if the human senses can be trusted, if history has any worth, yea, if the words inspired by the Holy Ghost have any claim to confidence or respect, let infidelity lay aside her skepticism, and "see and believe." Even though human testimony should prove delusive, we may point to those wonderful events which have, so to speak,

interrupted the course of nature; and while the common principles of philosophy are questioned in vain to solve the phenomena, Religion opens the mystery and exclaims, "This is the finger of God!"

Miracles are so satisfactory a proof of the interposition of God, for the purpose of revealing his character, his will, and his mercy to men, that we have indulged ourselves perhaps too far in expanding the statements which President Hopkins barely suggests. Have miracles occurred? We cannot doubt that they have. And we can conceive of no possible reason for their occurrence, except as attestations of divine revelations.

In his third Lecture, President Hopkins offers some criticisms on the ordinary division of the evidences of Christianity into external and internal. He suggests that many very dissimilar heads of evidence are, by this arrangement, classed together, and that it cannot be easily seen why some points are assigned to the one class, rather than to the other. He thinks also that there is no sufficient reason for the ordinary method, of discussing what are denominated the external evidences first, and afterwards, the internal.

"So far as the Christian religion rests on facts, it must rest on historical evidence; but so far as it is a system of truth and of motives, intended to bear on human character and well-being, it must be judged of by that reason and conscience which God has given us. There are in the mind, as God made it, standards and tests which must ultimately be applied to it. Men may be uncandid or irreverent in applying these tests, and so they may be in examining historical proof; and I have no more fear in one case than in the other. In arguing for or against such a system as Christianity, we of course take for granted the being and perfections of God; we have a previous knowledge of his works, of his providence, of the difference between right and wrong, and of the beings for whom the system is intended. Let, now, a candid man find in the system nothing absurd or immoral, but many things that seem to him strange, and little accordant with what he would have expected, and he will be still in doubt. He will make due allowance for the imperfection of his knowledge, and the limitation of his faculties, and he will hold his mind open to the full force of historical proof. But let him be shown a system, which, though he could not have discovered it, he can see, when discovered, to be worthy of a God of infinite wisdom and goodness,—let him find it congruous with all he knows of him from his works, coincident with natural religion, so far as that goes, containing a perfect morality, harmonizing with the highest sentiments of man, and adapted to his wants as a weak and guilty being,—and he may find in all this a ground of rational conviction that

such a system must have come from God, and so, that those facts which are inseparably connected with it must be true. The historical testimony may then be to him much as the testimony of the woman of Samaria was to her countrymen, after they had seen and heard the Saviour for themselves. And this is the natural course, when any system on any subject is presented to us. We inquire what it is, and how far it agrees with our previous knowledge; we come up to it, and examine it, and then, if necessary, we investigate the history of its origin."

On the grounds set forth in this extract, President Hopkins proceeds to discuss, first in order, the internal evidences of Christianity. And, in the first place, he finds "evidence of the divine origin of the Christian religion in its analogy to the works and natural government of God." The teachings of the Bible respecting the natural attributes of God, are coincident with the teachings of nature. The laws of nature discovered by induction and the moral laws contained in the New Testament imply the same perfections in God. The same attributes of God which are the basis of the one may be legitimately regarded as the basis of the other also. Thus, the law of gravitation in matter takes cognizance of worlds and systems of worlds; and yet the smallest particle, the merest mote that floats in the sunbeam, is within the sphere of its dominion. However it be driven on the wings of the tempest, it cannot be removed beyond the authority of that law. So in the government of God which he exercises over human spirits, his moral law extends to important deeds, such as sway a wide influence over the affairs of men, and also takes "cognizance of every idle word, and of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Again, "there is an analogy, both in their kind and their limit, between the knowledge communicated by nature, and that by Christianity." The same temper of mind is required in him who would study successfully the mysteries of nature and the mysteries of the word of God. Christianity, like created nature, is a system of means and a remedial system. God accomplishes his purposes in the kingdom of grace, as in the kingdom of nature, by a process, often slow and obscure; he uses means for the accomplishment of his ends, though he is adequate to speak in a word, and the work is done. The discussions contained in this Lecture are conducted in a very able and satisfactory manner.

They present a strong view of the argument. The closing portions of the lecture are truly eloquent and sublime.

The three next Lectures exhibit another branch of the internal evidence of Christianity—its adaptation to the nature of man;—its adaptation to the conscience as a perceiving power, and as a power capable of improvement; its adaptation to the intellect, the affections, the imagination, and the will. In these chapters, prominence is given to points often insisted on in the pulpit, but which have usually occupied a much smaller space in treatises on the evidences of Christianity. We see, however, in these adaptations, a proof that Christianity is from God. God has not left it without a witness. He has written its testimony in the nature of man. He has inscribed its unquestionable warrant upon the human spirit. The tablets of our immortality hold it as a sacred trust. The seal is guarded by innumerable sentinels with unswerving faithfulness. Wherever there is a conscience, an intellect, imagination, will, affections, there God has his advocate, and Christianity its defender. Though the historical evidence should be lost, this remains. Though our printed treatises should be annihilated, this writing from the finger of God cannot be false; it cannot be destroyed. Though skepticism should attempt to sweep over our Christian institutions like an angry flood, its whelming billows must leave this evidence of Christianity untouched. Flames cannot consume it. Oceans cannot drown it. The puny efforts of man cannot overthrow it. "*Ecrasez l'infame*," cried d'Alembert and his associates. "It took twelve men," said Voltaire, "to lay the foundations of Christianity; I alone will root it up. In fifty years, Christianity shall belong only to the history of the past." But d'Alembert could not crush the system of religion. That were to do violence to the rights of the human spirit; a force which all the power of infidelity cannot quell, would rise up to resist it. Crush the intangible structure of evidence, which God has reared, coëtaneous with every human spirit? Enjoin silence on a witness which courts cannot control, nor pain distort, nor bribes corrupt, nor interest turn aside, nor death destroy? Vain were the task! Bootless, hopeless the attempt! Voltaire's fifty years have expired. The

whirlwind of infidelity which he aroused, swept over France and passed on; but Christianity still lives. The force of his arm could not subdue it. His stratagems could not bring it to nought. Notwithstanding the open persecutions of its enemies and the covert attacks of false friends, the natural indifference of human hearts to its claims, and the innumerable obstacles which have stood in its way, it still lives, not a spark amid the waters, but stars on the darkened firmament of midnight. Its bloodless conquests have gone on, and every year it has achieved new triumphs. The evidences of Christianity are not abolished from the tablets of the human spirit. And, in respect to its diffusion, for one nation which enjoyed its blessings then, five have since received it; for one true believer then, now there are a score, if not an hundred; and the agencies for its propagation have increased a thousand fold. "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? . . . He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision."

The seventh Lecture shows that "Christianity could not have been originated by man;" the eighth exhibits the unique character of Christ, as a further testimony to the same end; it presents also the character of the apostles, the coincidence of the Acts with the Epistles, and the marks of honesty and candor in the first ministers of the gospel, which are commonly discussed under the head of the internal evidences of Christianity. Christianity is a unique system. In how many points it is above the likelihood of human invention. The sagacity of men could not have compassed it. Even if the idea of such a Christianity could have occurred to the mind of any one, he would not have ventured to propose it. If men expected a Messiah, if they thirsted after a revelation from God, it was not such a Messiah that they were looking for; it was not such a revelation that they anticipated. Here there was no worldly pomp, no gorgeous pageant at the accession of a mighty prince; there was no submission to men's opinions, no catering to their views, no seeking of popular applause, no setting in with an existing tide, so as to secure an earlier establishment in power. On the contrary, the religion of Christ was at war with human pomp and pride. It enjoined self-denial on men's

lusts and passions. It stood up in a spirit of unsparing opposition, against the principles of human selfishness. The Messiah, the prince, towards whom the desires of all hearts were directed, assumed the garb of poverty, and wandered about in lowly guise, a pilgrim upon earth. And instead of a splendid catastrophe, in which he should strike terror into his enemies, after a life of humiliation and suffering at last asserting his dignity by some sublime and convincing demonstration of his true character, he consented to be tried as a common culprit, and to be publicly put to death as a malefactor. Then, besides, the world was full of influences that were suited to oppose the progress of Christianity. Its literature, its arts, its habits, its principles, its pursuits, its languages and its modes of thought, all flowed in other channels; they were cast in a different mold. They were adverse to the spirit of Christianity. The new religion could not amalgamate with them. It waged an unsparing warfare against the most cherished plans of human ambition and national glory. It aimed to regenerate society. It was not content to tread along the low path of this world's sin and degradation. It made no compromise with vice in any of its forms. Its early adherents were subjected to ignominy and pain, to unsparing persecutions, unjust trials, condemnation and torturing deaths. And the only reward to which they were permitted to look forward was in another life. Truly this was a unique system; and small hopes could be entertained of its extensive reception, except on the simple ground of its divine authority and its inherent truth. And that it has gone forth in the world, notwithstanding its essential antagonism to established systems and principles, and the opposition of a thousand obstacles to its progress, still "conquering and to conquer," is a strong proof of its heavenly origin.

In the ninth Lecture, President Hopkins proceeds to the external testimony in favor of Christianity. The evidence is, in this part, not a course of reasoning, but a statement of historical facts. And he urges "that the evidence ought to be judged of by itself, simply as evidence; that no man has a right first to examine the facts, and make up an antecedent judgment that they are improbable, and then transfer this feeling of improbability over to the evidence." This was the error of Hume, so

far as he could have been said to examine the facts at all; he rejected the miraculous evidence of Christianity, not because the evidence was deficient, but because it was the system of Christianity, which the evidence was pledged to defend.

It is undoubtedly proper to receive the evidence concerning Christianity, as we would receive simple testimony on any point whatever. God has preserved such testimony; and Christianity shrinks not from the application of the test. It is incorporated with the world's history for eighteen hundred years. Its institutions exist, and must be accounted for. Its prominent actors have delivered over their names to imperishable records; their deeds and their influence have a place among the elements of action and of thought. The statements contained in the New Testament books—books, whose authenticity and credibility cannot be impugned—furnish the only satisfactory account of this state of things; and this account is wholly satisfactory. To quote the words of the author—

“Here, then, we find Christendom, and the Christian church—a body of men as distinctly organized and as intimately associated as those of any state—having its institutions, its traditions, and its records, all perfectly harmonizing with each other. These records bear on the face of them the marks of veracity; there is nothing known that is contradictory to them; they contain a fair and plausible account of the origin of the church. Admit the account, and every difficulty is removed. Refuse to admit it, and you destroy the very foundations of historical proof in any fact whatever. So much, indeed, are the general facts of Christianity implied in the present state of the world, and so much has it of that conviction which springs from universal notoriety, and which we can neither doubt nor trace to any particular source, that I do not hesitate to say, that the objections brought by Archbishop Whately against the existence and general history of Napoleon Bonaparte are quite as plausible as any that can be brought against the existence and general history of Christ.”

By various arguments, the authenticity of the New Testament records may be fully shown. These records contain the essential facts of Christianity. Christianity must stand or fall with them. But we can easily trace back the serious belief of this system, as founded on the Christian Scriptures, to the period in which Christianity professes to have had its origin. Persons worthy of the highest credibility for learning, judgment and piety are

scattered along during the whole period of eighteen hundred years, who have maintained the divine authority of every fact and doctrine of the word of God. Our faith in Christianity can be traced back to the age of miracles, to the earliest disciples, to the beginning of the gospel of the Son of God. We can go back from the present period, first to the age of Whitefield and Edwards, a hundred years ago; thence, to the age of Baxter and his contemporaries, sixty years earlier; thence, to the time of Luther and the Reformation, which is commonly reckoned at about A. D. 1520; thence, two hundred years more, to the time of Wickliffe, "the morning-star of the Reformation," and whose veneration of the Scriptures none can doubt. After this, we may ascend to the venerable Bede, who was born A. D. 672, and who has left comments on the Epistles of Paul; thence, to Gregory the Great, who sent missionaries from Rome to Britain under the broad seal of the Saviour's commission recorded in the New Testament, the basis of Christianity, the repository of its doctrines, its laws, and its institutions. Earlier than this, we have commentaries, homilies, exhortations and discussions of Christian doctrine, in each separate century. The names of Theodoret in the sixth century, Jerome and Chrysostom in the fifth, Athanasius and Eusebius in the fourth, Cyprian, Origen and Tertullian in the third, of Irenæus, Ignatius, Polycarp and Papias, still earlier, are familiar to all Christian scholars. In every century, the authenticity and credibility of the New Testament have been believed and acknowledged. Even the indirect testimony of the enemies of Christianity, Celsus, Porphyry and Julian, confirms the acknowledged authenticity of the sacred books. Manuscripts were copied from them in very early times, and versions were made into other tongues, indicating the respect in which they were held, and the importance which was attributed to them. The authenticity of the New Testament is also confirmed by internal evidences. On the supposition that the twenty-seven books contained in it are forgeries, we must believe that twenty-seven successful forgeries were committed within the space of sixty years, in the sight of thousands and tens of thousands of witnesses; and of such a nature that it was for the highest interest both of the friends and the enemies of Christianity to detect the

fraud, if there were any. President Hopkins remarks that of the six reasons laid down by Michaelis, which render the authenticity of a work suspicious, "not one can be attached to a single book of the New Testament." The books of the New Testament, then, were doubtless "written by the men whose names they bear, and at the time when they purport to have been written."

Still further, in respect to the records of Christianity, the skeptic may ask, are the books of the New Testament credible? Are they worthy to be believed? It is said in reply, they are credible because they are authentic; because the authors had the best possible means of knowing the facts which they state; and because the events recorded in these books have the concurrent testimony of a great number of witnesses. This testimony is confirmed by the "labors, dangers and sufferings, voluntarily undergone, in attestation of the accounts which they delivered." It can be shown that the sacred writers were neither deceivers nor deceived. We see in their works no signs of superstitious weakness or of enthusiastic fervor. And the books could not have been received, either at the time they purport to have been written, or at any subsequent time, if the facts recorded in them had not taken place. For the doctrines they contain are connected with events and institutions, which were to be judged of by the senses; and these institutions have come down from age to age, from the time when the writings of the New Testament affirm them to have had their origin. The order of the Christian ministry, the ordinance of baptism, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which have existed in the world from the beginning of the Christian church, are satisfactorily accounted for in the sacred books, and nowhere else. If they had any other origin, history does not state it. If they commenced at any other period, before or afterwards, history does not inform us of the time. If they are to be traced to any other facts or events than those which these books affirm, history does not tell us what those facts or events were. These institutions guard us against false historical accounts. They prevent forgeries. They carry us back to the age of Christ and the apostles, and give us, in the life, the instructions, and the death of the founder of our religion, a guaranty for the truthfulness of the received records.

“ Here, then, we have five authentic histories—four, of the same events—written by four different persons, who were themselves eye-witnesses, or had the best means of knowing what they relate. We have original letters, written at the time, both to bodies of men and to individuals, containing a great variety of indirect, and therefore of the very strongest, testimony. We find the books bearing every mark of honesty. We find the facts of such a nature that the witnesses could not have been deceived, and we find them laying down their lives to testify that they did not deceive others. We find institutions now existing, and rites observed, which hold such a relation to the facts of Christianity, as given in the books, that the books must be true. We find, moreover, no other account, nor the vestige of any, of the greatest revolution the world has ever known, while our accounts are in all respects simple, and natural, and perfectly satisfactory, assigning only adequate causes for effects which we know were produced ; and finally, we find in these books the only account of miracles that are worthy of God. Can any man, then, refuse to believe facts thus substantiated, and yet receive evidence for any past event? Can he do it, and pretend he is not governed by other considerations than those of evidence? ”

The testimonies of heathen writers constitute no mean confirmation of the other evidences of Christianity. Hebrew, Greek and Roman literature join their witness. In Hebrew, “ the Talmuds, commenced as early as the second century,” speak of Christ and his crucifixion, and “ of several of the disciples by name. They admit, also, that he performed many and great miracles.” Among Greek authors, Josephus, in a multitude of instances, supports and illustrates the New Testament history. In Latin, we have, in a manner more or less direct, the testimonies of Tacitus, Suetonius, Martial and Juvenal ; the celebrated letter of Pliny to Trajan ; Celsus, Lucian, Epictetus, Marcus Antoninus, Galen and Porphyry. Coins, medals and inscriptions, also, confirm the credibility of the Scriptures, showing their agreement with secular history, and establishing their trust-worthiness as truthful annals.

In his eleventh Lecture, President Hopkins exhibits prophecy as a final evidence of the truth of Christianity. The Old Testament contains many remarkable prophecies which have been fulfilled to the letter—prophecies relating to the Jews, Edom, Tyre, Babylon, Nineveh, Egypt, and Petra ; and especially those relating to Christ. The prophecies relating to Christ, though he was a being of so unique a character, elevated above ordinary conceptions,

and wholly different from the prevailing model of man, are very minute and full,—accurately designating that wonderful person, and designating no other. Those prophecies—beyond the ability of men to set forth—were honored with the most exact accomplishment. Other prophecies, uttered by our Lord and his apostles in respect to subsequent events and catastrophes, were, in the same manner, fulfilled. These prophecies, as they form a part of the records of Christianity and are intimately involved with its history and its doctrines, prove that the hand of God is with a system which he thus takes under his patronage. The veracity of God is pledged to its establishment and support. And the fulfilment of the prophecies proves the divine authority of the system with which they are incorporated.

Additional evidence of the truth of Christianity may be found in the history of its propagation in the face of innumerable obstacles, at first through the instrumentality of a small number of men, and under the most discouraging circumstances; also, in its tendency to diffuse itself more and more widely, and to carry in its train the blessings of civilization, learning, benevolence, purity and brotherly love; to teach men to do justly and to love mercy; to awaken in man a spirit of sympathy with his fellow-man, and to exalt the human soul from earthly thralldom to the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

Few, indeed, and weak must be the objections that lie against such a system; and deeply depraved the intellect that can seriously offer them as a balance to the overwhelming evidence of Christianity. That they have ever been thought to have any weight is a proof only of the blind credulousness of skepticism.

We have lingered, perhaps too long, on this topic. But it is a topic, in the present age, of surpassing interest and importance. Our object has been, not to put our readers in possession of the substance of President Hopkins' book, but only to give a fair analysis of its contents, and to inspire them with a wish to read it for themselves. It will well repay a careful perusal.

The work of President Hopkins stands by itself. It does not plunge at once into the subject like Paley, overwhelming the doubter with clear, precise, and unanswer-

able argument. It is not so warm, hortatory and earnest, as Wilson. It is not brief, like Addison and Leslie. It is not so rigidly philosophical and scholarlike as Butler. But it is calm, full, and convincing, and a noble service to the cause of religion and humanity.

We cannot close better than by presenting a single extract further, containing the summary of the arguments that have been presented in the volume.

“If we would see the proof in all its strength, we must look at these arguments in their united force. We know that an argument may be framed from separate circumstances, each of which may have little weight, while the force of the whole combined shall amount to a moral demonstration. It is in this way that some of the separate arguments for Christianity are constructed; but it is not thus that we present these separate arguments as conspiring together. We claim that there are for Christianity many separate, infallible proofs, each of which is sufficient of itself; but still, the general impression upon the mind may be increased when they are seen together. We claim that the proofs for the religion of Christ are like those for his resurrection given through the different senses of the disciples. Some believed when they merely saw him; some believed, when they saw him and heard his voice. Each of these was a separate and adequate proof; but Thomas thought it necessary, not only that he should see and hear him, but that he should put his finger into the prints of the nails, and thrust his hand into his side. Christ did not ask his disciples to believe without proof then; he does not now. He has provided that which must satisfy, if he be only fair-minded, even an unbelieving Thomas; and this proof as it comes in from very various and independent sources, is adapted to every mind.

“We have seen that there was nothing in the nature of the evidence, or in any conflict of the evidence of testimony and of experience, to prevent our attaining certainty on this subject. We have seen that there was no previous improbability that a Father should speak to his own child, benighted and lost; or that he should give him the evidence of miracles that he did thus speak. We have heard the voice of Nature recognizing, by her analogies, the affinities of the Christian religion with her mysterious and complex arrangements and mighty movements. We have seen the perfect coincidence of the teachings of natural religion with those of Christianity; and when Christianity has transcended the limits of natural religion, we have seen that its teachings were still in keeping with hers, as the revelations of the telescope are with those of the naked eye. We have seen that this religion is adapted to the conscience, not only as it meets all its wants as a perceiving power, by establishing a perfect standard, but also as it quickens and improves the conscience itself, and gives it both life and peace. We have seen that, though morality was not the great object of the gospel, yet that there must spring up, in connection with a full reception of its doctrines, a morality that is perfect. We have seen that it is adapted to the intellect, to the affections, to the imagination, and to the will;

that, as a restraining power, it places its checks precisely where it ought, and in the wisest way ; so that, as a system of excitement, of guidance, and of restraint, it is all that is needed to carry human nature to its highest point of perfection. We have seen that it gives to him who practises it a witness within himself ; and that it is fitted, and tends, to become universal, while it may be traced back to the beginning of time. Such a religion as this, whether we consider its scheme, or the circumstances of its origin, or its records in their simplicity and harmony, we have seen could no more have been originated by man than could the ocean. We have seen the lowly circumstances, the unprecedented claims, and the wonderful character of our Saviour. Around this religion, thus substantiated, we have seen every possible form of external evidence array itself. We have seen the authenticity of its books substantiated by every species of proof, both external and internal. We have seen that its facts and miracles are such that men could not be mistaken respecting them, and that the reality of those facts was not only attested, on the part of the original witnesses, by martyrdom, but that it is implied in institutions and observances now existing, and is the only rational account that can be given of the great fact of Christendom. We have seen also, that the accounts given by our books are confirmed by the testimony of numerous Jewish and heathen writers. And not only have we seen that miracles were wrought, and that the great facts of Christianity are fully attested by direct evidence, but we have heard the voice of prophecy heralding the approach of him who came travelling in the greatness of his strength, and saying, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord.' We have seen this religion, cast like leaven into society, go on working by its mysterious but irresistible agency, transforming the corrupt mass. We have seen it taking the lead among those influences by which the destiny of the world is controlled ; so that the stone which was cut out without hands has become a great mountain ; and, finally, we have seen its blessed effects, and its tendency to fill the earth with righteousness and peace.

"These things we have seen separately ; and now, when we look at them as they stand up together and give in their united testimony, do they not produce, ought they not to produce, a full, a perfect and abiding conviction of the truth of this religion ? If such evidence as this can mislead us, have we not reason to believe that the universe itself is constituted on the principle of deception ?"

ARTICLE V.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY, *with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency.* By the Rev. CHARLES BRIDGES. From the Sixth London edition. New York. Robert Carter. 1846. 491 pp. 8vo.

PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY, *in a Series of Essays.* By JOHN BOWDLER, jr., Esq. First American, from the Edinburgh edition. Boston. B. Perkins & Co. 1845. pp. 285, 12mo.

WE take pleasure in commending to the attention, especially of clergymen, the new edition of Bridges on the Christian Ministry. An American reprint, in two volumes duodecimo, from the second London edition, was issued in 1831. Since that period, four editions have appeared in England, under the author's superintendence,—the last, in March, 1844. By comparing the present elegant octavo with the New York edition of 1831, we perceive that some parts of the work have been re-written, and considerable additions and numerous valuable references and quotations have been introduced, enriching almost every page. The whole now forms a most excellent manual for the preacher and pastor, and deserves a prominent place in every young minister's library. It is written by a minister of the Church of England, and is, of course, adapted to the members of that communion. Hence, there are statements in the chapters on Baptism and Confirmation, to which we could not fully subscribe. But with these slight exceptions, we regard the work as a highly important and useful addition to our instrumentalities for raising up, under God, an efficient, faithful, devoted and successful ministry. The numerous quotations introduce the reader to a great many of the best works which have been written on the ministerial office, and to many of the most accomplished models of clerical

excellence. It is but too plain, that the existing ministry of most Christian denominations is far less efficient, than, with the mighty instrument of God's truth in their hands, and the divine Spirit offered to accompany all sincere and earnest endeavors, we might expect it to be. There must be a cause for this want of efficiency. Is it not to be sought, at least in part, in the want of some important qualifications in the clergy, in a defective Christian character, in an unfaithful discharge of their duties, in insensibility to the weighty motives which pertain to their office? This volume will essentially aid those for whom it is designed, in their self-scrutiny, and, like a new "Reformed Pastor," we hope will lead the way universally, to a more devoted cure of souls.

Christianity in its development may be defined as consisting in doctrine, experience, and practice.

These three parts are distinct, and separate each from the other; and yet so connected, that Christianity cannot be exhibited in its completeness or in its true character, in the absence of either. And especially are these parts so connected, that the teachers and propagators of Christianity can have no success in their work, except they embody in their own character these three distinct and essential parts of it. This is the point we expect to establish in our present remarks.

The doctrine, experience, and practice of Christianity are essential to its just exhibition, and to success in propagating it. In the absence of either of the parts, any efforts, however zealous, must prove abortive. Or if men have success, it is in propagating another religion, and not Christianity itself;—a religion retaining, perhaps, some of the excellences of Christianity,—but so changed as to deprive it of its distinguishing features and of its saving power.

In the term doctrine, we include all those truths and facts drawn from the word of God, which stand in connection with the supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, atonement for sin by his death, procuring for lost and ruined man the renewing and sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God, and pardon of sin through faith in his blood;—all those truths and facts generally embraced in what is termed the Calvinistic system.

By the term experience, we mean the application of doctrinal truth to the mind and heart, in such a way as to inspire in the soul, before "dead in trespasses and in sins," the holy fear of God, beginning in the deep conviction of the moral corruption, the guilty and ruined state of the soul, and resulting in penitence, submission, love and confidence in Jesus Christ as the only Saviour, and in a desire to serve and glorify God with all our powers.

Every one of the facts and doctrines of revelation is adapted to call forth a corresponding exercise of the soul, love, joy, confidence, hope, submission, patience, meekness, decision. Experience, then, is the application of doctrinal truth to the mind and heart in a way to elicit these exercises, until they constitute the prominent traits of a character, the principal feature of which is the holy fear of God.

By practice we mean, not only a life of integrity with respect to men, but a life of obedience to the preceptive part of Christianity; not only the cultivation of a spirit of piety towards God, but a sacred regard to the order and ordinances of his house, as he has made them known in his word.

These several parts of Christianity must be imbodyed in the character of its teachers, or it cannot be justly exhibited or successfully propagated. There may, indeed, be some approach to the several parts of the religion of Christ; some of the doctrines may be apprehended, in a degree, and some feelings may be cherished, as the subject of them supposes, as a lively response to the doctrines received; and there may be in the life a great approximation to the morality of the gospel; and yet the whole system, so far as it is illustrated in this individual case, may be wholly destitute of vitality. It scarcely deserves the name of a rough outline of Christianity, or statue without life.

And as it has no life in itself, much less has it the power to impart life to others. Such is the Arian version of Christianity, or more especially that given by Socinus, and his admirers and followers. It may, indeed, help to cultivate the natural amiability of some individuals; but it never cuts the sinner off from all hope of salvation in himself, or leads him to Jesus Christ, as the only relief for the guilty.

But there may be also a more correct apprehension of the Christian doctrine. Many of the main points in the Calvinistic system may be very correctly defined, and contended for with ability and earnestness; and many passages of Scripture by which those views are sustained, correctly interpreted; and yet these views may be entertained wholly in a speculative way, without producing one emotion of love to God, hatred of sin, or gratitude to the Saviour. Theological professors, and students in theology, and the professed teachers of Christianity have been found, and are to be found at the present day, who have studied and taught many of the facts and profound truths of Christianity, and have discoursed eloquently on their individual and relative value and importance, who knew nothing of their experimental power. Sometimes the teachers of Christianity of this class, in what is called the Christian church, have been very numerous. But whether such teachers can give a just view of Christianity, or do any thing effectual for its propagation, scarcely admits of a question. No man can have a deep, clear and accurate knowledge of doctrinal truth, until he has experienced its power on his own heart. If only speculatively taught the doctrine of the new birth, or of regeneration by the Spirit of God, he must be a stranger to the feelings of the new-born soul, the godly sorrow, the lively faith, and the joyful hope, inseparable from it. That God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son to die for its redemption, is a deeply interesting fact of revelation; but the speculatively taught could never say, 'that wonderful love constrains me to surrender myself, soul and body, to the service of Christ.' And so of all the other doctrinal truths of revelation,—if they are not received by faith, and wrought into the feelings of the soul, and become matters of experience, they cannot, in the nature of things, be understood.

And certainly, if the doctrinal truths of Christianity are not accurately understood by its teachers, they cannot give a just exhibition of it to others, or do any thing effectual for its propagation.

But if the teacher of religion cannot give a just view of the doctrinal parts of Christianity, however learned, until he has felt their power on his heart, much less can he give a just view of religious experience.

Religious experience is one of the essential parts of Christianity. It is the hinge, on which the salvation of the soul turns. "He that loveth is born of God." "To as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even as many as believed on his name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of man, but of God." "I have rejoiced in thy testimonies," said the psalmist, "as much as in all riches."

Religious experience is inseparable from doctrinal truth. For though there may be in the mind a correct apprehension of some doctrinal truths without experience of their power, yet there can be no true Christian experience, without the application of doctrinal truths.

There is much which passes for Christian experience, even among what are termed evangelical Christians, which vanisheth away "like the morning cloud and early dew." Whatever there was, bearing a resemblance to true Christian character, was produced by other causes than the doctrines of God's word; and the subjects of the operation could give you no correct ideas of those doctrines. They profess to have been illuminated, but have received no light.

But genuine Christian experience is inseparable from doctrinal truth. Divine truth is the immediately operating cause. It is the view the mind has of those doctrines which humble the pride of the heart, and call forth the feelings of penitence, faith and love, confidence, hope and joy;—according to that declaration of the apostle James, "of his own will begat he us by the word of truth." Doctrinal truth is the seed, the experience of it is the stalk or trunk, and the life is the fruit. The experience of the truth in the heart is something which is, so to speak, tangible. It makes up a large part of the character. In its inseparable connection with divine truth, it lies at the foundation of character. It is that by which the church must judge, in connection with other things, of the sincerity and fitness of those who propose themselves as candidates for her communion.

Now it is this experience of the energy of divine truth on the heart, by which the powers of the soul are sanctified and wrought up to a high degree of reverence for God, which constitutes one of the chief qualifications of

the teachers of Christianity. A man who has a deep experience in the things of God has resources within himself, from which he can draw largely for the instruction of others. And it is this experimental view of Christianity, in connection with doctrinal truth, which God blesses for its propagation.

It has been said reproachfully of the generation of our ministers which preceded the present, that they preached nothing but experience; they knew nothing else, and could preach nothing else. They did, however, preach doctrine and experience both, though they gave, in their ministry, a large space to experimental preaching, and this was the reason why God made them instrumental of the conversion of thousands of souls. They preached so much the doctrinal and experimental parts of Christianity, that they built many stable churches. Those who became converts to Christianity through their instrumentality generally understood the doctrines, and their experience of the power of truth on the heart was often profound.

These were the characteristics in the preaching and in the converts in the apostolic days, as well as in the days of our fathers, and converts were astonishingly multiplied. And if, with the superior advantages of the rising ministry now, they preach doctrine and experience as much as the fathers did, God will give them equal and probably greater success than he gave the fathers in propagating his religion.

But to suppose that a religious teacher who has had no experience of the power of truth on his own heart can explain the operations of truth, in all their variety and force, so as to be successful in winning souls, is absurd. It would be expecting of a man what he did not possess; to teach what he never learned, that a stream might rise higher than the fountain, and that a bitter fountain could send forth sweet waters.

But there is another part of Christianity which is essential to its completeness,—the effect of the other two, and strictly connected with them. It is practice or obedience. The great teacher of Christianity said, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." This is a part of Christianity which can have an existence only as it proceeds from the other two. It is derived from them as much as the fruit of the

vine is derived from the vine, or from the branch on which it has ripened. And Christian practice or obedience is essential as matter of proof that we are sincere, and that our faith and love are of God. When the experience of divine truth on the heart is so profound as to carry us constantly into the divine presence, so that we are transformed into the image of God, and our obedience to him is implicit, and our kindness and faithfulness to men is unquestionable and unquestioned, there is power in such a character, which cuts like the truth itself. Doctrine and experience in the lips of such men are stated and explained in "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," and God will never fail to give success to the efforts of such men for the advancement of his cause.

It must be confessed, however, that there may be correct views of doctrine in a religious teacher, and considerable depth of experience, when the practical part of religion is but imperfectly carried out. It is in religion as it is in physics,—we could tell precisely what would be the effects of certain causes, if we knew also what are the resistances to be met with. The resistances which religion has to meet are various in various individuals, and in the different circumstances of life. Some men may have very great hindrances to piety in themselves, in their tempers or propensities, or in their associates. Some, by the force of habit or education, may entertain very loose views of the duties which God requires of them, and of the order and discipline of his house.

Now, however well versed a religious teacher may be in the other parts of Christianity, if his correct theory or experience fails to work in him an elevated piety, one of the chief elements of his success is lacking. He must of necessity be unable to give a just view of the religion of Christ, and very few persons will be affected by his statements, where there is a marked discrepancy between his doctrine and his life. Or, if his doctrinal sentiments are sound and his piety unquestionable, yet if he take the ground that nothing can be known from the word of God as to the manner or form of the church of Christ, or of the materials of which it is composed, and he should preach the gospel, see conversions as the result of his labors, and go on to establish churches and build them of men, women and children, converted and unconverted,

and unite, if the state of things should favor it, church and state together, so as to be able to prove that we are a Christian nation,—if a Christian teacher pursue a course like this, and, for a time, is elated with his success, yet his success is not a true and lasting gain to Christianity. The building of a church of such materials and in such a manner is sure, as it has always done, to subvert or counteract the noble designs of Christianity. It can no more propagate a pure Christianity as the legitimate fruit of its own labors, than the Jewish synagogue could do it. It may profess more of Christianity, it is true; but as long as it gathers in its bosom the elements of every form of heresy and unbelief under the whole heaven, it sends forth in its efforts a merely nominal, a perverted or a spurious Christianity. Such, if we mistake not, is the melancholy condition of a large part of what is now termed Christendom. Even in connection with some portions of the church highly evangelical, and where there is avowed a sacred regard for the supremacy of the word of God as the rule of faith and practice, it is maintained that unconverted persons, if they are the children of Christians and have the seal of a regeneration which they never experienced and may never experience, put over them, are, to all intents and purposes, members of the Christian church, entitled to certain privileges, and having certain claims on the church unlike the claims of any other unconverted persons. Now, if there was authority for this in the statute book of Jesus Christ, or if such practice had never proved injurious, or was always innocent in its tendency, it would be presumption and impiety in us to speak of it as counteracting the efforts of truth and piety in other respects for the propagation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. But since the New Testament affords not a solitary example of approval of the membership of unconverted persons, old or young, but the address to every church supposes the membership only of the regenerated, and since the uniform effect of such a course has been to bring down the church from the lofty eminence of faith and love to a level with the world, and has always proved a fruitful source of corruption to Christianity, we feel ourselves authorized and compelled to speak of such practice as constituting a most effectual hindrance to the

success of the otherwise laudable efforts of the Christian world to win the nations to Christ. Such a practice renders it impossible to give to the world a just exhibition of Christianity. Such appendages to Christianity, added by human wisdom or tradition, must inevitably undermine and destroy the fabric which they propose to raise. Until Christianity is disencumbered, in its teachers, of the prepossessions and prejudices of education, and emancipated from the blinding and bewildering influence of unscriptural creeds, of councils, and of great names, and the precepts of Jesus and apostolic example are allowed to rise above them all in carrying out the practical parts of Christianity, there can never be a just exhibition of it before the world,—such an exhibition as shall render it permanent, and make it successful in its triumphs over idolatry, superstition and spiritual death. There is nothing so high and commanding in the universe, for the Christian teacher, as the authority of Jesus and of his apostles. We may try to legislate for him, but the laws we make will not stand. When we use the best possible methods to interpret the laws he has promulged, and the records of the official conduct of his apostles, and yield them an implicit, child-like obedience, neither the sword nor the faggot can hinder the progress of Christianity, or demolish the fabric we raise.

But if, in our weakness, we annul or add to, or attempt to supply what to us seems a deficiency in the laws of Christ, and the form and ordinances of his house, we shall appear as strangely unwise to those who come after us as the philosophers and astronomers of the present age would appear to us, should they attempt to form a new code of laws to govern the sun in its orbit, so as more perfectly to equalize its light and heat, and adjust it to the convenience of the inhabitants of the earth. They might do this, and injure none but themselves. If we change, or disannul, or add to the laws of Christ, we not only dishonor ourselves, but we inflict an injury on the cause we profess to love, and hinder its benign influence from reaching the souls now ready to perish.

The inference which we draw from these facts is, that the great object we should seek to attain at the present moment is a deeper experience of the power of doctrinal truth on the hearts of the teachers of Christianity. If

we would see the tide of the divine benevolence rolled on, and the chief hindrances to the more rapid triumphs of Christianity removed out of the way, there must be, in its teachers, a greater subjugation of the soul to its deep and powerful doctrines.

There must be less adoration of human names and achievements, and more of the name of Jesus and his truth. We will never undervalue or disparage human learning. But neither will we exalt it above the plain and simple, yet comprehensive doctrines of Christianity.

While we read the writings of men distinguished for their genius, research and learning, we must keep our eye fixed on the infinite purity and glory of the doctrines which God has revealed as the only foundation of our hope. The more childlike our disposition is respecting them, the more implicit our subjection to them, the clearer will be our discernment of their meaning. If we are willing to be in subjection to Christ and his truth, we shall know of the doctrine.

If this deep experience of the love of God and of all the doctrines standing in connection with it, is attained by the teachers and propagators of Christianity, the results will be most happy. We shall then not fear to study or to preach the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel. We shall preach them experimentally. Overwhelmed ourselves with a sense of the divine love, we can, by the grace of God, impress the minds of others. Those whom we instruct will have a kind of knowledge which will keep the heart and direct the life. We shall have a keener moral sensibility, and a clearer discernment of all the truths which relate to the practical parts of Christianity, and moral courage to carry them out.

If we could drink more deeply of this spring of living water, we should have more harmony among Christian teachers. There would be less wrangling, and more prayer. We should spend less time in defining our position, and more in efforts to propagate the sweet and precious doctrines of Christianity, which are for the healing of the nations. The discipline of the house of God would be maintained, and the house would become so luminous with truth, that the unconverted who have entered it under excitement, and not under the experience of

doctrinal truth, would be glad to leave it, unless indeed they should be humbled by it in a new and genuine conversion. When this becomes the great characteristic of religious teachers and of our churches, we shall have men enough to go to the heathen. Instead of being burthened with debt, we shall have a surplus at our command, for new enterprises and new fields of labor; and every form of opposition will give way before the light of truth.

ARTICLE VI.

THE CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP OF BURKE.

ONE of the topics of discussion in Mr. Everett's eloquent address on assuming the presidency of Harvard University, is the utility of classical studies. Among other observations in illustration of this theme, he remarks as follows:—"The Latin and Greek are indeed often thrown aside—(after completing the prescribed course in college)—as useless; but is the lawyer, the statesman, the preacher, the medical practitioner, or teacher, quite sure that there is no advantage to be derived in his peculiar pursuit from these neglected studies, either in the way of knowledge directly useful, collateral information, or graceful ornament? Is not the fault in ourselves? We have laid a foundation which we neglect to build upon, and we complain that the foundation is useless. We learn the elements, and neglecting to pursue them, we querulously repeat that the elements are little worth. . . I am quite confident that the young man who should, while at school and at the university, diligently pursue the study of the ancient languages, who, on quitting college, instead of turning his back on the great writers with whom he had formed some acquaintance,—on Homer, on Thucydides, on Plato, on Demosthenes, on the great Attic tragedians, on the classic authors of Rome,—should regularly devote but a small part of the day, a single hour, to their continued perusal, would, at the meridian and still more in the decline of life, experience and admit that, both for instruc-

tion and pleasure, these authors were some of the best, the most useful, of his reading; that, if in public life, he addressed juries and senates better, after refreshing his recollection with the manner in which Demosthenes handled a legal argument or swayed a deliberative assembly;* that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* bore a re-perusal as well as *Childe Harold* or *Marmion*, (without disparaging *Byron* or *Scott*); that the glimpses into the heart of ancient oriental life which we obtain from *Xenophon's* historical romance (a work which such a man as *Scipio Africanus* never wished to have out of his hands,†) are as trustworthy and interesting as the vapid changes rung in modern works of imagination on contemporary fashionable life in England; in a word, that the literature which has stood the test of twenty centuries is as profitable as the 'cheap literature' of the day."

We propose, in harmony with these remarks, to offer here a few examples which we have gathered almost at random from the pages of *Burke*, illustrative of the force and beauty which a writer or speaker may give to his style from a ready command of the resources of classical learning.

The writings of this great master of the English tongue afford abundant evidence of his familiarity with the best productions of Greek and Roman literature. Around every subject on which he employed his pen, whether literary or political, philosophical or historical, he could throw not only the attractions of his own peculiar, matchless style, but the lights also of the richest classical illustration; showing that his mind was crowded with the stores of such learning, and that he could pour them forth on any occasion with a fulness well nigh inexhaustible.‡ It is much to be regretted that we have not a fuller account of his early studies, and especially of the means

* It was at this point of the discourse, we think, that the orator, turning towards *Mr. Webster*, who was sitting at his right, said—"Tell us, you, sir, who of all men have least need of such aids, whether it be not so?" The effect was electrical. The whole assembly burst forth into the most tumultuous applause, in token at once of their sense both of the justice of the compliment and the tact with which it was bestowed.

† *Cicero*, *Tusc. Quæst.*, Lib. II. c. 26.

‡ We have seen it stated that *Burke* composed his *Vindication of Natural Society* in opposition to *Bolingbroke*, in the country, without access to books,

which were employed with so much success to imbue his mind with a taste for the great authors of antiquity, and to give him such a mastery over their fine sayings and beautiful sentiments. If Prior in his *Life of Burke* has detailed all the information which exists on the subject, it is exceedingly meagre. There is a more important end than the gratification of mere curiosity to be subserved in the transmission of knowledge in relation to the manner in which eminent men have been prepared for the part which they subsequently perform in the affairs of life. An important auxiliary to their success, if not the principal ground of it, may frequently be disclosed in laying open the details of their education; and others may be capable of deriving advantage from the same methods of instruction, though not gifted by nature with the same capacity for improvement. The principal facts which Prior mentions in connection with the part of Burke's discipline here in question, are the following.

Until his twelfth year, he appears to have been occupied with the common branches of youthful study, which he pursued chiefly at home, under the direction of private teachers. At this period he was sent to an academy in the north of Ireland, taught by a learned Quaker, and enjoying the deserved reputation of being one of the first classical schools of the time. Here he remained three years, prosecuting the usual studies which are required for admission to the university. It was during this period that he laid the foundation of the taste for elegant learning, which he afterwards cultivated with so much zeal; and in the superiority which even then his companions in study accorded to him, he already anticipated the higher triumphs which he was destined to achieve in the severer competitions of manhood. His passion for the ancient classics was so great that they seemed, says his biographer, to be "his diversion rather than his business;" so much more of a relaxation was it to him

being obliged to depend mainly on his memory for the multifarious facts and minute views of ancient history, politics and literature, which he has introduced with so much effect into that discussion. It is difficult to conceive how any man could be subjected to a severer test of the accuracy and extent of his knowledge, or how he could exhibit, under such a test, powers and acquisitions superior to those discovered in this instance. Of such a man Fox might well say, without transcending the bounds of truth, that he had learnt more from him alone than from all other men and authors.

than a task to cultivate this species of learning, at a period of life when most youth are allowed to be indolent without reproach, and dull without the suspicion of inferiority. In 1744, in his fifteenth year, a year sooner, by the way, than was customary for such advancement, he entered Trinity College, at Dublin. In the course of study here pursued, the chief place appears to have been assigned to the Latin and Greek classics. The amount of time devoted to them was such as to enable the students to read, not as with us, merely select portions of a few of the more distinguished writers, but the entire works of all the more important Latin and Greek authors. Ample scope was thus afforded for enabling young Burke to gratify still further the decided classical taste which he had brought with him to the university. That he availed himself of this opportunity, and rose to the first rank of scholarship in this department among his college contemporaries, is established by the fact that "in June, 1746, he was elected a scholar of the House, the qualification for which being a successful examination in the classics before the provost and senior fellows, confers a superior degree of reputation through life in that branch of learning on him who succeeds; and as candidates are not eligible till the third year of residence in the university, it will be observed, by referring to dates, that he obtained this distinction the moment the regulations permitted." There is evidence also that before his attainment of this signal honor, he had won some of the highest prizes for proficiency in classical knowledge, with which the college was accustomed to reward this description of merit.

But while he cultivated with such assiduity the whole field of classical study, he devoted himself to particular parts of it with still greater interest. Of the ancient orators, he was most partial to Demosthenes. The writings of Plutarch he read much, and prized among the most valuable which antiquity has transmitted to us. He was familiar also with the Greek tragedians, especially Euripides and Sophocles. His favorite Latin authors were Lucretius, Virgil, and above all, the sententious and polished Horace. It may be mentioned as a somewhat singular fact in the history of criticism, that Burke, while he conceded to Homer the unquestioned superiority in point of invention and sublimity, maintained, in departure

from the judgment of the great body of learned critics, that as a whole the *Iliad* is decidedly inferior to the *Æneid*.

We will pass now to the object which we had more particularly in view in taking up the pen. It has just been stated that among the Latin authors to whom Burke devoted the days and nights of his youth, no one engaged his interest more strongly than the bard of Venusia. He was so much at home in his reading of the classics, that he was not obliged to confine himself to any single writer ; * but from no one of them, or indeed all of them together, if our observation has been correct, does he quote so frequently as from Horace. The qualities of this poet adapt him, beyond almost any other, to such a use. The general correctness and truth of his observations, the terseness and elegance of his diction, the aphoristic form of his expressions and the universality of his thoughts, which are founded to so great an extent upon the permanent attributes of human character and life, render him the poet of all times, and impart to his utterances a sort of prophetic significance, which the experience of every day brings, as it were, into some new fulfilment. Mr. Wilberforce speaks repeatedly in his *Journal*, of his taking his Horace with him in his walks, for the purpose of augmenting his stock of poetic Latin aphorisms, with which it is necessary for every man in the British Parliament to be well furnished, who expects to shine in debate. The felicity with which Burke has availed himself of the aids of classical scholarship both in his written and spoken productions, deserves to be pointed out as one of the marked peculiarities of his manner, and as revealing one of the secrets of his power over minds of a more cultivated order. But passing over, in the present article, for the sake of confining ourselves to a single view, those other and higher effects of classical culture, for the illustration of which we might also refer to the works of Burke, let us recall a few specimens of the skill for which he was so distinguished in giving embellishment and power to his discourse, by apposite citations from the ancient classical writers, especially his favorite Horace.

* The younger Pitt was very expert in the art of quotation ; but it was remarked of him that Virgil was his almost invariable authority.

For the first example which we will mention, turn to the celebrated speech on *Conciliation with America*.^{*} The orator is defending the right of the colonies to be represented in Parliament, and refers, in proof of the good effects which might be expected from the concession of that right, to the example of Wales. Before this privilege of English subjects had been extended to the Welsh, they were "ferocious, restive, savage, and uncultivated; sometimes composed, never pacified. Wales, within itself, was in perpetual disorder; and it kept the frontier of England in perpetual alarm. Benefits from it to the state, there were none. Wales was only known to England by incursion and invasion." But at length, in the reign of Henry the Eighth, a system of representation was bestowed upon Wales by the British Parliament. "From that moment," proceeds Burke, "as by a charm, the tumults subsided; obedience was restored; peace, order and civilization followed in the train of liberty. When the day-star of the English constitution had arisen in their hearts, all was harmony within and without—

—— simul alba nautis,
Stella refulsit,
Defluit saxis agitatus humor;
Concidunt venti; fugiuntque nubes
Et minax, (quod sic voluere) ponto
Unda recumbit."[†]

The 14th ode of the same book supplies another passage, which is very happily applied. In his Letter to William Elliot, Esq., written soon after the commencement of the French Revolution, he deprecates the disposition which was shown by some of the sovereigns of continental Europe to favor the principles of the French revolutionists, and declares that by such a course they were undermining the foundations of their own governments;—that they were helping to diffuse a spirit of disorganization, which, while it left for a while to the established forms of social order all the external marks

^{*} The edition of Burke's Works which we use is the one printed at New York in three volumes, 1833. See for the passage here referred to, Vol. I, p. 239.

[†] Carm. Lib. I, 12.

of their ancient grandeur and strength, was in effect depriving them of their support, and preparing the way for their utter ruin. Such a result these outward badges and decorations could not avert, after the substance, the reality itself, was destroyed. "The fine form of a vessel," he says,* "is a matter of use and delight. It is pleasant to see her decorated with cost and art. But what signifies even the mathematical truth of her form? What signify all the art and cost with which she can be carved and painted and covered with decorations from stem to stern? What signify all her rigging and sails, her flags, her pendants, and her streamers? What signify even her cannon, her stores and her provisions, if all her planks and timbers be unsound and rotten?"

Quamvis Pontica pinus
 Silvæ filia nobilis
 Jactes et genus et nomen inutile."†

In the same letter he says again,‡—"The great must submit to the dominion of prudence and of virtue, or none will long submit to the dominion of the great," and then adds, as if Horace had written the line for this very place—

Dis te minorem quod geris, imperas. §

In his *Observations*, so called, upon a publication entitled, *State of the Nation*, he attacks the author's reasoning, and exposes its inconclusiveness and inconsistency as follows. "He (the author) tells the world, that if France carries on the war against us in Germany, every loss she sustains contributes to the achievement of her conquest. If her armies are three years unpaid, she is the less exhausted by expense. If her credit is destroyed, she is the less oppressed with debt. If her troops are cut to pieces, they will by her policy (and a wonderful policy it is) be improved, and will be supplied with much better men. If the war is carried on in the colonies, he tells them that her loss of her ultramarine do-

* Vol. 2, p. 177.

† p. 179.

‡ Carm. Lib. I, 14.

§ Carm. Lib. III, 6.

minions lessens her expenses and ensures her remittances :

Per damna, per cædes, ab ipso
Ducit opes animumque ferro.*

“If so, what is it we can do to hurt her? It will be all an *imposition*, all fallacious. Why, the result must be—

— occidit, occidit
Spes omnis et fortuna nostri
Nominis.”*

A more exquisite satire upon avarice never flowed from the pen of moralist or bard, than Horace has given us in the second piece of his Epodes. In his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Burke alludes to this piece, and applies the closing lines of it with a beauty and effect which could not be surpassed. In order to perceive this, the reader must have in mind a distinct view of the connection. The French disorganizers having confiscated the lands of the church, the policy of the act was attacked by some and defended by others. Those who approved it, urged in its favor, that it would be of great service to the interests of agriculture to have this species of property come into the hands of the “*enlightened*” usurers, who, it was said, would purchase it. Burke, on the contrary, denies that any such advantage would ensue, even supposing it possible that men of this class should consent to become cultivators of the soil. They had not the knowledge or practical skill necessary for making them useful in such labors; and hence, should they engage in them, would only bring to the work an ignorance and incapacity, from which the greatest evils were to be feared. “However,” he goes on to say,† “there is no cause for apprehension from the meddling of money dealers with rural economy. These gentlemen are too wise in their generation. At first, perhaps, their tender and susceptible imaginations may be captivated with the innocent and unprofitable delights of a pastoral life; but in a little time they will find that agriculture is a trade much

* Carm. Lib. IV, 4.

† Vol. I, p. 541.

more laborious, and much less lucrative than that which they had left. After making its panegyric, they will turn their backs on it, like their great precursor and prototype. They may, like him, begin by singing—*Beatus ille*—but what will be the end?

Hæc ubi locutus fœnerator Alphius,
Jam jam futurus rusticus,
Omnem relegit idibus pecuniam;
Quærit calendis ponere."

In his *Letters on a Regicide Peace*, speaking of the influence which French manners and tastes were exerting on the common classes in England, he says of theatres that "they are established in every part of the kingdom, at a cost unknown till our days. There is hardly a provincial capital, which does not possess or does not aspire to possess, a theatre-royal. The dresses, the scenes, the decorations of every kind, are in a new style of splendor and magnificence, whether to the advantage of our dramatic taste on the whole, I very much doubt. It is a show and spectacle, not a play, that is exhibited. This is undoubtedly in the genuine manner of the Augustan age, but in a manner which was censured by one of the best poets and critics of that or any age: *

——— migravit ab aure voluptas
Omnis ad incertos oculos, et gaudia vana;
Quatuor aut plures aulæa premuntur in horas,
Dum fugiunt equitum turmæ peditumque catervæ—

I must interrupt the passage, most fervently to deprecate and abominate the sequel,

Mox trahitur manibus regum fortuna retortis."†

In the speech, again, on *Conciliation with America*, Burke cites certain passages from some of the published acts of the colonies, which had given offence in England, but which he shows had not exceeded in plainness and

* It is evident from this expression that Burke's partiality for Horace was not accidental, but the result of deliberate conviction.

† Epist. Lib. II. 1, 188 sq.

freedom the tone of address which it was lawful for loyal English subjects to employ. "Is this description," he asks—the language of these acts—"too hot or too cold, too strong or too weak? Does it arrogate too much to the supreme legislature? Does it lean too much to the claims of the people? If it runs into any of these errors, the fault is not mine. It is the language of your own acts of Parliament.

Non meus hic sermo, sed quæ præcepit Ofellus
Rusticus, abnormis sapiens.*

It is the genuine produce of the ancient, rustic, manly, home-bred sense of this country."

He is speaking in his *Letter to a Member of the National Assembly*† of the writings of Rousseau. He commends his genius, but has a poor opinion of his ethics. "We cannot rest," he goes on to say, "upon any of his works, though they contain observations which occasionally discover a considerable insight into human nature. His doctrines are so inapplicable to real life and manners, that we never dream of drawing from them any rule for laws or conduct, or for fortifying or illustrating any thing by a reference to his opinions. They have with us the fate of older paradoxes,

Cum ventum ad *verum* est, sensus moresque repugnant
Atque ipsa utilitas, justi prope mater et æqui."‡

The citations contained in the foregoing examples are all from Horace; and others of a similar character might be added to them from the same source. Such quotations depend, obviously, for much of their effect on the associations which they awaken in the mind of the reader. Hence, they need to be so familiar that one can refer them at once to the authors to whom they belong, and be carried back by them to those recollections of youthful study, which retain so strong a power over the soul so long as the soul itself remains capable of memory and emotion. Leaving, therefore, those writers to whom Burke frequently alludes, who are generally less studied

* Serm. Lib. II, 2, 2, 3.

† Vol. I, p. 240.

‡ Serm. Lib. I, 3, 97, sq.

in our schools, we subjoin two or three examples from Virgil, who has been the companion of every scholar's youth, and who is never forgotten.

Measures were under discussion for applying the principle of uniformity in taxation, as Mr. Burke thought, in a very absurd way. Referring to this point in his *Observations on the State of the Nation*, he says*—"Among all the great men of antiquity, Procrustes shall never be my hero of legislation; with his iron-bed, the allegory of his government, and the type of some modern policy, by which the long limb was to be cut short, and the short tortured into length. Such was the state-bed of uniformity. He would, I conceive, be a very indifferent farmer who complained that his sheep did not plough, or his horses yield him wool, though it would be an idea full of equality. They may think this right in rustic economy, who think it available in the political:

Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Mævi,
Atque idem jungat vulpes, et mulgeat hircos."

In the celebrated passage† respecting Lord Bathurst, which Mr. Webster has imitated in his Eulogy on Adams, that line from the Pollio,||

— acta parentum
Jam legere, et quæ sit poterit cognoscere virtus,

will be found to be applied in striking harmony with the relations of thought which the connection discloses.

Lord North, the Palinurus of the English ship of state during our war of the Revolution, was no doubt wished a thousand times by our patriotic forefathers, like his great prototype, at the bottom of the Hadriatic. He escaped, however, such a fate; though, if Burke's account of him be correct, it was not because he always saw clearly which way he was steering. He has thus described him.§ "I do not mean to speak disrespectfully of Lord North; but it would be only to degrade myself

* Vol. 1, p. 134.

† Conciliation with America, Vol. 1, p. 226.

‡ Ecl. 3, 90, 91.

|| Ecl. 4, 26. The change from the *oratio directa* to the *indirecta*, and of *parentis* for *parentum* was of course necessary.

§ Letter to a Noble Lord. Vol. 2, p. 196.

by a weak adulation, and not to honor the memory of a great man, to deny that he wanted something of the vigilance and spirit of command, that the time required. Indeed, a darkness next to the fog of this awful day, lowered over the whole region. For a little time the helm appeared abandoned—

Ipse diem noctemque negat discernere cœlo,
Nec meminisse viæ mediâ Palinurus in undâ.”*

The citation from the seventh Eclogue, in the *Speech against Hastings*,† is well applied. “I will do Mr. Hastings the justice to say that, if he had known there was another man more accomplished in all iniquity than Gunga Govin Sing, he would not have given him the first place in his confidence. But there is another next to him in the country, whom you are to hear of by and by, called Debi Sing. This person, in the universal opinion of all Bengal, is ranked next to Gunga Govin Sing; and what is very curious, they have been recorded by Mr. Hastings as rivals in the same virtues :

Arcades ambo
Et cantare pares, et respondere parati.”‡

We had marked other passages for citation ;—the only difficulty has been that of selection—but it is more than time, perhaps, to put an end to them.

Claudite jam rivos, pueri ; sat prata biberunt.

HORÆ CLASSICÆ.

* *Æneid* III, 201, 2.

† Vol. 3, p. 361.

‡ *Ecl.* 7, 4.

ARTICLE VII.

THE BAPTIST CONTROVERSY IN DENMARK.

Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung vom Jahre 1845. Herausgegeben von den Professoren Burmeister, Niemeyer, Gruber, Pott, Rödiger, Wegscheider, u. s. w. November, Nr. 245-268. Halle.

BY THE EDITOR.

AN interesting feature of the present times is the attention which the Baptist question has awakened in Germany, Denmark, etc., and the influence which the principles and practice of the Baptist churches are exerting in favor of religious freedom on the continent of Europe. As an evidence of the interest felt in this subject, several publications of importance have appeared, written not only by Baptists and their opponents, but by persons who, though not connected with the denomination, have still stood forth as their defenders. Some of the newspapers in Denmark have come forward in support of their cause. *The Copenhagen Post*, a radical reform newspaper, and *The Fatherland*, published in the same city, advocate religious liberty for the Baptists, and censure the edict which led to their persecution. The latter paper, in speaking of the Baptists, says: "Are their doctrines erroneous, let the clergy and schoolmasters prove them to be so to the people. The schoolmaster, Rasmus Sörensen of Venslöv, however, a man whose love of truth and unaffected Christian faith are questioned by no one, has just published a book, entitled, 'What is the Holy, Universal Church,' etc., in which he shows that infant baptism is neither evangelical nor apostolic. If it is not possible to refute him, and to render the errors of Baptists innoxious, by counter arguments and proofs; but if, on the contrary, it must be admitted that their doctrines are confirmed by the word of God and the history of the Christian church, then, in spite of imprisonments, condemnations, banish-

ments, etc., there will soon be in Denmark as many Baptists as there are now Lutherans. Therefore, we now call upon all the zealous disputants amongst the clergy by argument and proofs to refute the statements put forth in Rasmus Sørensen's book."

Not only in Denmark, but in Germany also, the controversy about the Baptists has introduced a new topic of literary disquisition. In the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* for November, 1845,—one of the most important literary periodicals of Germany,—we find a review of several Danish works called forth by this question. This review contains an account of the origin and progress of Baptist sentiments in Denmark, of the manner in which they have been sustained on one hand and assailed on the other, and of the means undertaken to suppress them. The present article is mainly a translation of that review.

The facts lying at the basis of this movement, says the German reviewer,—which are and must be generally acknowledged on all hands, we have gathered from individual narrations, and combined in a single view. We can confidently anticipate the interest of our readers. For occurrences like those to be exhibited here, characterize the spirit of the church in whose bosom these have appeared. In our days, when remarkable movements are taking place, even in the Catholic church, who is not interested to inquire how it is in the evangelical church, and where the truly evangelical is to be found? The facts before us are worthy of consideration, as contributing to the solution of this question.

Mr. Münster, an engraver, and the leader of the Danish Baptists, and who has been, on that account, the chief object of the persecutions directed against them, some time since came to the conviction, through the diligent reading of the Scriptures, that neither infant baptism nor sprinkling for baptism was agreeable to the institution of Christ or the practice of the apostles. The works on ecclesiastical history to which he had access informed him that both had a much later origin. For a considerable period he maintained these views by himself. In 1835, he visited Copenhagen, and joined himself to the followers of Grundtvig. But he soon discovered that they set the Apostles' Creed above the Bible, making it an absolute rule of faith, and that they denied the Scriptures to the

laity.* This he regarded as nothing but "domestic popery." He separated himself, therefore, from them, and again stood alone. In 1839, Mr. Köbner, a Baptist from Hamburg, undertook a journey into Denmark, by the suggestion of Mr. Oncken, for the purpose of forming a connection with the awakened Danes, mentioned in the note, and of attempting "the introduction amongst them of sounder scriptural views of baptism, and the constitution of a Christian church." "On this journey," says Mr. Köbner, "I succeeded in forming a friendly acquaintance with many believers, and held numerous and well attended meetings; but the doctrine of adult immersion, as opposed to the sprinkling of children, found little acceptance amongst them. They clung to the latter with much greater firmness and decision than is generally the case in Germany. It happened one evening, that a discussion arose on the subject of baptism, between myself and a countryman of the name of Rasmus Ottesen, a man endowed with considerable natural abilities, and held in great esteem amongst his fellow believers. He attacked me with violence, directed against me all the force of his wit, and in his heat advised me to go to Münster, in Copenhagen, where I should find people of my own stamp

* The following extract from a pamphlet published in London in 1841, entitled *Revival of Religion in Denmark, including an account of the Rise and Present State of the Baptist Churches in that kingdom, etc.*, gives a full view of the sect of Grundtvig.

"About twenty years ago, when Rationalism, the theology of human wisdom, was in its zenith in Germany, all spiritual life became extinct in Denmark. The country lay evidently in the shadow of death; but the Lord, about this time, again took compassion on his people, and roused them from their slumber by his Spirit. This work he commenced by kindling the sacred fire in a remote corner of the land, by means of an old journeyman shoemaker. But it was soon communicated to hundreds in all parts of the kingdom. The awakenings were, for the most part, amongst country-people and the inhabitants of villages, who were exceedingly zealous in proclaiming and spreading abroad the truth;—they held frequent meetings amongst themselves for mutual edification, and to awaken others; but they did not separate from the Lutheran State Church, and they had not the most remote idea of the nature of an Apostolic Church. In doctrine, they were strictly Lutheran. The essence of Christianity, justification by Christ, and not by works, they clearly recognized and admitted; but they were perfectly in the dark on the sovereignty of God in the free choice of the objects of his redeeming grace; and, like the Lutheran Church, were Arminian in sentiment. When this awakening took place, the subjects of it were called 'The New Sect,' so unknown had Christianity and the fundamental doctrines of the State Church become. The awakened were not only persecuted by the public in the usual manner, but the government forbade their meetings, and sought by prosecutions, imprisonments, and fines, to suppress them. But 'the foolishness of God was wiser than men, and the weakness of God stronger than men;' and the government at length perceiving that they accomplished nothing, relaxed their efforts;

and similar taste. This hostile intimation proved to be the means, appointed by God, for the formation of the present Baptist church in Denmark. Hurt by the bitterness and ill-treatment of my opponent, I became silent, and thus terminated the conversation; when the thought occurred to me, that the intimation he had given me might possibly be a hint from God, and I determined immediately to act upon it, altered my route, and proceeded directly to Copenhagen, which I had not intended to visit. Here I found a small spot that God himself had prepared, and into which, with trembling hands, I deposited the seed, small, indeed, as a grain of mustard seed, but which has already become a flourishing plant, having put forth three branches. A small band of believing friends had gradually collected round a man of the name of Mönster, with him had examined the doctrines of Grundtvig by the light of truth, and had rejected them; they had searched the Scriptures diligently, and had arrived at the conclusion, that the baptism of children was an erroneous practice, which ought to be given up, and that it would be better again to substitute immersion for sprinkling. Of the existence of other Christians besides themselves, who rejected infant baptism, they were ignorant, never having

though, whenever Christianity began to show itself in other parts of the country, the persecutions were renewed. At last, however, they ceased every where, and the country-people held their meetings, and delivered their simple addresses, without interruption.

Since the year 1825, however, a material alteration has taken place in the doctrines of these Lutheran Christians. Hitherto their opinions respecting the value and authority of the Word of God, had been sound; but now, a clergyman in Copenhagen, who had long been the champion of Christianity against Rationalism, and, as such, was held by them in high estimation, brought forward the assertion, that the so called Apostolic Creed was older than the New Testament, and more important than the Scriptures; that it was exclusively the true Word of God, the foundation on which the Christian church was built, the rule of faith, on which all must rest their hopes for eternity, and that it ought, as the baptismal covenant in baptism, to constitute the sole ground of admission into the Christian church. In order to the spread of this new baptismal covenant, the sacred Scriptures were in every way decried in the publications of Grundtvig, the author of the doctrine, and his followers. It was maintained, that they were only intended for the extension of religious knowledge, and more for the clergy than the people, who were unable to peruse them in the languages in which they were given. Doubts of the entire genuineness of the New Testament were admitted, and the impossibility of any one's being awakened by reading the Bible or any other books or tracts, was firmly asserted. It was only by the word audibly proclaimed, and especially by listening to the before-mentioned creed, or to parts of it, from the lips of ordained priests, that faith could be attained; on the contrary, all books, without exception, were a dead letter—such were the opinions promulgated, and by degrees the greater part of the awakened became infected with these pernicious doctrines.”

heard of Baptists and their opinions. I imparted to them the knowledge that God had bestowed upon me, and then left them to the care of him, whose it is to give to planting and watering their appropriate increase."

In the latter part of the same year, Messrs. Oncken and Köbner visited Copenhagen. They instructed Münster more fully, who became confirmed in his convictions, and was baptized with ten others. He was afterwards made the superintendent of the little church. But the church soon attracted the notice of the government. By virtue of the ordinances instituted against the Anabaptists of the time of the Reformation, their movements were declared illegal. Münster and his associates protested against the effort to identify them with the Anabaptists. But their protest was of no avail. The ancient law was pronounced still in force. Münster was then put in prison; still, however, they persisted in their views. The alternative was then offered them, either to leave the country, or to be proceeded against as rebellious subjects. They chose the latter; and, as they continued their religious assemblies, they were imprisoned and fined with increasing frequency and severity. These measures of the government became known beyond the limits of Denmark. The English Baptists, in 1841, sent two delegates, John Eustace Giles and Henry Dawson, to Copenhagen, who petitioned the king to grant to their Danish brethren the free exercise of their religion. They also addressed a circular to the Danish clergy, in a truly Christian spirit pleading for the promotion of liberty of conscience and the manifestation of brotherly love. This latter petition was offered probably under the impression that in this affair, all ministers would be heard. This impression, however, was without foundation, and hence the request based upon it produced no effect. But the petition to the king was not without its influence. He immediately requested the opinion of the Court on the proposal of the English delegates; but the Court were contented with obtaining the opinion of the bishops. Thus, in an affair of so much importance, the judgment of the body of the clergy was not asked; even the theological faculty of the national university were not consulted at all on a question so nearly related to their department; although in earlier times, and

especially in 1740, under Christian VI, in a like case, this was done first of all.

In the summer of 1842 the Baptists of the United States were also represented by a delegation consisting of Professors H. B. Hackett and T. J. Conant, who visited Denmark, and had interviews with the principal men of the government in relation to the course which was pursued towards the persecuted party. Among other measures by which they sought to promote the objects of their visit, they addressed a public letter to the preachers and members of the Baptist churches, in which they acknowledged the community of faith between these Baptists and those of America, and made known the fact that the violent proceedings against them had fixed the attention and called forth the sympathy of great multitudes on the western continent.*

The question to be decided was, "whether, and how far, toleration could be granted to the Baptists in Denmark?" During the discussion, two only of the national bishops said a word in favor of liberty of conscience, and in opposition to constraint in matters of religion. One of these was, probably, Rasmus Möller, bishop of Laaland, a man of liberal spirit, who is since dead. The name of the other is not known. The rest replied, however earnestly the sect in question may protest against the title of 'Anabaptists,' still they must be regarded as such, when viewed from the stand-point of the national church; for any one who administers baptism a second time to the same persons, is an Anabaptist. It must, perhaps, be conceded that the denomination is different in very essential points from the Anabaptists designed in the Augsburg Confession, and against whom the decree of March 5, 1745, was directed. But on the other hand it cannot be denied that, as there is a historical connection between the Baptists and the Anabaptists, so also their doctrine of baptism is substantially the same; and hence it should be remembered that the Baptists chose this designation for the very purpose of having it understood that they do not esteem the baptism of the national church Christian baptism. All other Christian sects acknowledge one another's baptism. In however numerous and impor-

* See an interesting and extended report of the visit of this delegation to Denmark, in the Baptist Missionary Magazine for November, 1842.

tant points they differ, one Christian basis is common to them all. But this is not the case with the Baptists. While in this way they sunder themselves from the whole Christian world, they look upon themselves as no longer bound by anything which is received among other Christians, and thus open for themselves the way to the most arbitrary course of action.*

This opinion, not of all the bishops, but only of a majority of them, and, as every one can see, not even harmonious with itself, resulted in a decree of the king, dated Dec. 27, 1842, by which the future condition of the Baptists in Denmark was to be regulated. The decree begins as follows:—‘The Baptists in Denmark cannot be tolerated in the free exercise of their religion, because their principles differ from those of the Augsburg Confession. But that they may not be exposed to any constraint upon their consciences, by being deprived of the opportunity to worship God agreeably to their own views, the following provisions are made.

1. They may establish a church of their own order in Friedericia (a small city in Jutland). They may have there a house of worship, with the privilege of using their own form of baptism and the Lord’s supper. Baptisms, however, must be always administered in an enclosed place. They may elect their own teachers or pastors; but they must immediately inform the chief magistrate, the bishop and the minister of the place, whom they have chosen, and exhibit to them the results of their successive elections hereafter. They must also furnish to the same authorities a list of their members; and not admit any one into their assemblies who has not been received as a member of the church.

2. Baptists residing in other parts of the kingdom may meet together for private devotion, and the celebration of the Lord’s supper in their own way. They must, however, notify the minister of the place, and the principal police officer, of such assemblies.

* This reasoning of the Danish bishops shows how little they understand our principles. They seem to imagine that the only alternative is the authority of the church on the one hand, and mere caprice on the other; so that if a man is not swayed by tradition, nothing remains but that he should follow his own will. We maintain, however, a different alternative,—the authority of the church on one hand, and the authority of Christ, as revealed in the New Testament, on the other. We choose the latter; and how far we are governed in it by the arbitrariness of human will, it is easy to decide. ED.

3. That the offspring of Baptist parents may not be deprived of the benefit of being incorporated into the Christian church, the parents, whether they reside in Friedericia or elsewhere, must have their children baptized within the period prescribed by law. If the parents are unwilling to do it, it may be attended to by the magistrates. The children shall receive the usual course of instruction in schools. If, when they come of age, the children themselves and their parents wish for their reception among the Baptists, and the church makes no objection, they may be received. But the children must, for that purpose, be sent to Friedericia, if their parents do not already reside there. If the children are not thus received by the expiration of their sixteenth year, they must be presented for confirmation in the national church.

4. If a Baptist wishes to marry a Lutheran, he must first give a bond that he will bring up all the children by that marriage in the Lutheran church.

5. The Baptists must abstain from all proselyting; and they may on no pretence receive any one into their number without having fulfilled the foregoing conditions.

On the general question, whether religious liberty could be conceded to the Baptists, all the bishops were heard. But on the particular question, whether the children of Baptists were to be baptized by force, a shorter process was instituted. As the opinions of the bishops on this point were essentially different, it was proposed to a single clergyman to confer with the Baptist pastor concerning it, and report the result. This proceeding, as might have been expected, was of no use; and Tryde, the clergyman nominated to the office, proposed in his report that the Baptists should be permitted, wherever they might reside, to defer the baptism of their children till they should reach their nineteenth year—the extreme limit allowed by law for children to receive confirmation. The Court did not see fit to assent to this proposal, but gave another clergyman opportunity to speak on the report. Bishop Mynster, the person alluded to, was one of those who had already decided against the Baptists. He said, ‘if the Baptists will not receive their children into their own church,’—(which they cannot do before they are grown up and baptized on a personal profession of their faith,)—

‘the state must be justified in receiving them into the national church; the Baptists, however, ought not to be compelled to procure the baptism of their children, nor to take part in it; but it should be required of the preachers to take the responsibility of seeing that such children are brought to be baptized.’ This motion prevailed, and constrained baptism became the law.

Opposition soon appeared in various quarters. There were individual Baptists who did not refuse to have their children baptized, provided that they themselves were not forced to participate in the transaction; but many others would not assent to it on any ground. The children of the latter were either enticed from home by artifice, or carried off by the police; and if the parents, relying on their privilege as parents, and exercising their right to govern their own houses, refused to yield until they were overcome by physical force, then they were punished for resisting the magistrates. The opposition of the ministers, too, continued; many declared that they could not consent to an act by which the most sacred ordinances of the church were taken in hand by the officers of police; this, according to their conviction, would be to take the kingdom of heaven by force. Kierkegaard, a minister in Seeland, was the most determined in his opposition. Having labored in vain to persuade a Baptist in his parish to permit his child to be baptized, he complained to the bishop and court. Upon this he received command to baptize the child without the consent of the parents, but made the manly declaration that he could not reconcile it to his conscience to administer baptism by force, and he must decidedly refuse to do it, even though it should cost him his office. He was secretly urged to persuade a neighboring clergyman to perform the rite; but he affirmed that he neither could nor would expect another to do what he could not conscientiously do himself. Upon this, permission was granted to the preachers to administer baptism beyond the limits of their own parishes, if the police magistrates could prevail on them to do it. We see from this, how they sought by manœuvring to avoid the administration of baptism by force, which was enjoined by the government. The question now arose whether such ministers as Kierkegaard should be prosecuted, fined or deposed for their opposition to the magistrates. Hitherto it had

not been done; but Clausen affirms that this extremity has been very nearly reached.

These historical notices have been gleaned from the Danish publications. It remains to show in what manner the subject has been treated by various authors.

The first writer to be noticed is bishop Faber. Ten years ago, at his accession to the episcopal office, he addressed to the clergy of his diocese, a pastoral letter, distinguished by its high minded and truly evangelical spirit. This letter warranted the expectation that he would have declared himself against religious constraint. But his book proves that he was certainly not one of the two bishops, who spoke in favor of the toleration of the Baptists. The very title of it—*The Anabaptist Movements in Denmark*—shows that he assumes, with the Court, that the Baptists of the present time are no other than the Anabaptists against whom the ancient decrees were directed; and this conclusion is confirmed by the Introduction, in which he attempts to prove their identity from history. This attempt, however, is nothing more than a superficial narrative of the old Anabaptists, particularly of their fortunes in Denmark; and it is so completely unsuccessful, that the author himself confesses at the end that he does not know to which of the many divisions of the Anabaptists the present Baptists belong. When the English Baptists, by their delegation, acknowledged the Danish brethren as belonging to the same body, he declares that this intimation has no ground but their own opinion. But, on the other hand, he assumes that the sympathy and visits of the Hamburg missionaries prove that they belong to the Mennonites; and yet this assumption has no better foundation than his opinion. In the first part, he gives a view of the doctrine of the Baptists in respect to baptism, from a pamphlet by one of their number, entitled, *What is Baptism, and who are to be baptized?* Their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, he professes to derive "from a manuscript by the hand of an Anabaptist;" but he gives no more definite account of it. For his statement of their doctrines of church discipline, of the Word of God, of religious teachers, of divine worship, and of the relation of Christians to the civil government, he does not give any authority at all. His view is impartial, full and clear; but after this, it must be incomprehensible to every candid

reader, how he could still call them Anabaptists, and how he could be ignorant of their difference from the Anabaptists in points which they themselves had specified, and he also had referred to. In the second part,—containing an examination of Baptist sentiments from “a Christian point of view,”—the author commits from the beginning the capital error of affirming that it is not important to gain a stand-point whose validity is conceded by the Baptists; but only one which meets the judgment of the Christian community. This is the more remarkable, because he now, in fact, adopts a basis acknowledged by the Baptists, to wit, the Spirit sent by Christ to his church, and embodied by the apostles in the writings of the New Testament. But these are only fair words; for it soon appears that by the true church, in which alone the Spirit and the word are rightly embraced, he means only the evangelical-Lutheran church. This is a standard which the Baptists do not acknowledge; but it is easy to see why he selected it. To this standard he brings his arguments and his interpretation, and arrives at the following conclusions: Christian baptism involves a creating act of almighty power and mercy, exercised towards our fallen race; from the sacramental significance which attaches to it in opposition to John’s baptism, arises the validity and even necessity of infant baptism.—This agrees with the doctrine of the Scriptures. That it cannot be proved that the apostles instituted or administered it, is a matter of no consequence; such authority was not at all necessary; it would even have been pernicious. How far this inference drawn from detached passages of Scripture, interpreted according to church tradition, and compounded with ill-digested fragments of speculation, will satisfy well informed and impartial readers, and especially how far it will convince Baptists what great benefit they lose in giving up infant baptism, we will not undertake to say. The author thinks all is now as clear as sunlight. From this reasoning it is easy to see to what result, by adopting such a standard, he has come. It is briefly this. The act withholding religious freedom from the Baptists is to be viewed, not as an act of the state, because they have not violated the laws of the state; but as an act of the Christian church, executed by the government, as its only valid organ. The Christian church, the true univer-

sal Christian church in Denmark, is justified in expecting Oncken, Köbner, Münster, and similar emissaries to cease their attacks upon it. The state is bound, as a Christian duty, to prevent their repetition. The state has the power to secure this end, and, as the organ of the church, it is not at liberty to decline to do it. To neglect it would be not so much an exhibition of Christian tolerance, as the manifestation of a spirit of indifferentism. The spreading of sects arises from the imperfections and the sluggishness of the church. The remedy is to be sought, not in more unobstructed religious freedom, which would only produce wider divisions, and thus increase the evil, but in the care of the state to promote the religious instruction and edification of the people, and the founding of institutions properly within the sphere of the church, and answering to the wants of the times. This is almost the only point worthy of approval, in this otherwise bigoted dissertation; and from this bishop it is evident that the Baptists have nothing to hope.

The second author is Grundtvig. His work forms a remarkable contrast with the preceding. Hitherto we have heard a bishop, from whom, in view of his earlier professions, we might have expected liberality, advocating exclusiveness and constraint; but now Grundtvig,—a man who resigned his ministerial office years ago, because he could not in conscience remain in a national church in which Professor Clausen, with his differences from the received doctrines was tolerated—raises his voice decidedly against the persecution of the Baptists. But inconsistencies are nothing unexpected in this eccentric individual, a man having in his constitution more of poetry than science, who, after the expiration of several years, again sought and obtained an office in the same national church in which Clausen continues to stand and teach. The natural feeling of justice seems to have risen above his ecclesiastical theory, and he steps forth in defence of the persecuted, although he distinctly declares that he does not agree with them. This little philippic proves that it is really religious persecution, whenever the Baptists or others are imprisoned and punished merely for holding and propagating a faith differing from that of the national church. It is particularly interesting to see how he dissipates the illusive appearance of a pretext for it. It is said, "they

are punished, not for their religious opinions, but for their violation of the laws." This passage, appearing in the edicts of Christian VI. against the Baptists a century since, had been adopted by Faber with all seriousness. But Grundtvig intrepidly declares, that persecution is still persecution, whether it is chargeable to the law or to the judge; and if the law forbids the profession of religious opinions differing from those of the national church, it is on account of their religion that those who profess these opinions are persecuted. And that such a religious persecution is a Christian act, he continues, Papists might maintain; but Protestants, never; for it is opposed alike to the spirit and the letter of the New Testament. The national church adopts the Augsburg Confession, which protests especially against all religious persecution. The kings of Denmark are, therefore, pledged by the law of their station to the Augsburg Confession. Hence the government have no right to institute religious persecutions; and though all the clergy should demand them, the national church, both on the ground of Christianity and of the law of the realm, is bound to resist the claim. The clergy desire only to get rid of their rivals, and hence it is that they call upon the civil power to persecute their opponents. Finally, he shows that persecution is not the means of securing peace and unity; that, as all experience teaches, it only sows the seeds of division; but he remarks, even if the opposite were the case, still, persecution would not on that account, become a Christian act. Oppression and constraint secure at best, only a lifeless order and stiff uniformity; and this is very far from being the unity of spirit which Christianity aims to produce.

The work of Eiriksson, which is the next that has fallen under our attention, is very voluminous, extending to 627 pages, 8vo.; yet, though it contains many things irrelevant, it is read without weariness. Eiriksson is a native of Iceland, educated at Copenhagen; and, like his countrymen generally, generous, intrepid and lively. Biblical and historical investigations made him sensible of the imperfections of the national church; he was led to entertain a regard for the Baptists; and, finding that they were persecuted, he undertook their defence, without reference to personal consequences. Should he be pronounced a heretic and persecuted, or even excluded

from the ministerial office, still he has learned to live by the labor of his hands, and these anticipations do not trouble him. He disapproves Martensen's artifices to separate faith from baptism; and takes occasion to administer an able lecture to those modern speculations, which, concealing themselves behind established formulas, and pretending to be strictly orthodox, have introduced a new element tending to complete pantheism. He differs also from Faber, in opposition to whom he shows expressly that the Baptists of Denmark have no historical connection with the Anabaptists; and still further, that both their principles, and their civil and moral relations prove them to be wholly different from them.

In the first part, he reproaches the bishops for the untenableness, self-contradiction and the wholly legal character of their declarations, and examines the ordinance occasioned by these declarations, together with its probable consequences. But neither does he agree with Grundtvig, who, as a Christian and a church-member, renounces his personality; he takes exception to religious persecution merely on exterior grounds; to him the Christian faith and the Augsburg Confession, as Grundtvig holds them, as symbols literally binding, are the very occasions of religious persecution. But these principles of Grundtvig are papal, rather than ecclesiastical. He complains especially of his appeal to the law of the kings of Denmark, for this has ever been the standard raised by ecclesiastical zealots against all new sects. In short, his whole course is fundamentally incorrect, unworthy of Christianity and its doctrines, and extremely pernicious in its effects. It is easy to see that much truth is here mixed in an attractive way with much also that is false and exaggerated.

After these negative investigations, the author undertakes, in the second part, the proof that the sentiments of the Baptists, especially in respect to baptism, are truly Christian and scriptural. He exhibits, in several points, the difference of the Baptists from those of the church, and then proves, in opposition to Martensen and Faber, that baptism presupposes instruction, conversion and faith; that John the Baptist, and still more rigidly Christ himself, and after him the apostles required this; that the apostles baptized adults only, and that the obligations of

the baptismal covenant are appropriate to no others; that immersion is not a mere external ceremony, but necessarily belongs to the symbolic meaning of baptism; and finally, that the communication of the Holy Spirit, the forgiveness of sins, etc., are the effects, not of baptism, but of faith. In two controversial chapters, directed against Martensen and Faber, he proves that the passages cited by the latter in favor of infant baptism are nothing to the purpose. After this, follow historical views of the questions, when infant baptism arose, how it became universal, and why it was retained by the Reformers, especially by Luther. The result of these inquiries is that the church, in its claims hitherto, has shown itself neither evangelical nor Protestant; that it is its duty to adhere solely to the gospel; to do away all persecution, oppression, opposition and restraint; to reform and correct its articles of belief and discipline, and, in place of infant baptism, to introduce a suitable religious consecration. The author then pointedly addresses statesmen and jurists who maintain the unchangeableness of the king's code, and adds a series of free and timely remarks on the incompetency of the highest purely juridical body, the Danish court, to exercise a control in spiritual matters, and closes with an appeal to the illumination, culture and piety of the present king, which justify the highest hopes. It is possible that, in his youthful zeal, the writer may have formed many rash conclusions, nourished too sanguine hopes, and been too desultory in his manner of proceeding. But full justice ought to be awarded to his genuine Protestant and Christian sensibility and his prudent liberality. We can only say of him, what Cicero said of the young orator—"sit quod resequare possis."

In this work the national clergy were so severely assailed, that it might have been expected that many and loud voices would be raised in defence of the threatened palladium of infant baptism. But whether they were not regarded a true palladium so universally as the bishops thought, or whether they found the basis too weak to trust themselves to undertake the defence, or whatever were the reason,—only one voice from among the preachers was elevated in favor of the doctrine of the church. This is a work of 124 pages, occasioned by the larger volume of Eiriksson, and entitled "*The Bible Doctrine of Chris-*

tian Baptism." The author embraces every opportunity to assail Eiriksson, whom he charges with ignorance of language, and intolerable self-sufficiency. He often himself entertains his readers with an extremely dubious interpretation, depending on dogmatic suppositions, and thus assumes an air of infallibility, which, with the arrogance of hyper-orthodox zealots, looks down upon all who think differently as ignorant, unbelieving, or malicious perverters of the truth. He has avoided one principal fault of Faber, inasmuch as he acknowledges the necessity of proceeding in the investigation from a stand-point common both to the Baptists and the church, viz. the Scriptures, and especially the New Testament. He takes the Baptists only for what they wish to be, and does not, like Faber, impute to them anabaptism, against which they protest. In general, he passes by questions of church history and ecclesiastical right, and confines himself to the exhibition, and defence of Biblical truth.

The author boasts, at the end, that he has proved three things: that sprinkling is valid baptism, that infant baptism is a New Testament ordinance, instituted by Christ himself, and that baptism is a means of salvation. But however much he prides himself on the excellence of his interpretation and the certainty of his conclusions, they are both without foundation.

If we compare the reasonings and interpretations of these works one with another, even under the most favorable view, it will appear that as much can be said against the received doctrine of baptism in the Lutheran church as for it; and that the New Testament does not determine the question for either party. And hence all impartial persons will decide that the evangelical church (Lutheran) most certainly has no right to reject and persecute the Baptists, inasmuch as they stand on the same gospel ground, but have come to different results. The whole subject admits of different views; and our decision will be according to the stand-point we take. In such a case, the church (national) should not consent to be at the same time one of the parties and the judge.

It was under such a conviction that Professor Clausen entered into the controversy; and his work is the most calm, clear and weighty of all. He confines himself to the question whether the decree of the government requir-

ing the baptism of the children of Baptists, unconditionally and without exception, can be justified; whether the baptism of their children ought to be forced upon the Baptists as "a benefit," when they themselves declare it not only without value or meaning, but unjust, sinful and presumptuous; whether preachers may be required to administer baptism under such circumstances, without taking it into consideration whether they do or do not find a collision between their position as the servants of the church and the servants of the law, or an opposition between the letter of the law and the spirit of the gospel. In order to avoid partial and prejudiced replies to these questions, it is specially important to have the main grounds of them distinctly understood. He enumerates three principal ones. The first is that which views baptism as a sacrament, a divine ordinance, the peculiar institution of Christ, to which all born in the Christian church are entitled; so that the church not only may not prevent the baptism of any, but must not consent to its omission. The second is the juridical, according to which the national church, by virtue of the royal code, is immutably bound to the Augsburg Confession, and consequently bound to require the baptism of children, which is expressly demanded by it. The third is the practical view, which justifies the using of force, from a regard to the evil consequences which might follow if children should be permitted to grow up without belonging to any religious community. These are, in fact, the principal grounds on which compulsory baptism is or can be defended; and the author suggests, in respect to each, all that is capable of being said in its favor.

Professor Clausen remarks further, that much may be said against each of these views. If infant baptism is regarded as, in the highest sense, a sacrament, it will be difficult to separate its absolute necessity from a superstitious idea of some magical influence accompanying it. If the validity of the royal code is maintained, still the law of the gospel is to be viewed as the highest and most unchangeable law; and ecclesiastical regulations which bear the impress of the times in which they originated, are to be retained or modified, in conformity with this unalterable standard. Moreover the idea of ecclesiastical unity loses its truth, if men will be so wedded to that which is external as to prevent high-minded advancement,

and maintain unity by menaces and constraint. In conceding that possible bad consequences might arise from the omission of infant baptism, an argument is furnished, not for the forced baptism and admission to the church of the children of Baptists, but for greater care in their religious education; for in spiritual things, least of all, can the end sanctify the means. This is a question which must be answered in view of the essential nature of a church; it belongs not to the national church of Denmark, but to the Christian, Protestant, evangelical church universally. Here the author triumphantly shows, that it is a violation of religious liberty on Protestant principles, to impose upon a sect which is acknowledged to be a Christian body, and blameless in its civil relations, any thing which interferes with the peculiarities of their faith, or to prohibit any thing to which they think themselves bound by their religion. He establishes his point by referring to Luther's noble dissertations on Christian liberty, and to the practice of the national church of Prussia. He then shows with equal clearness that the compulsion of infant baptism is at war with the meaning and dignity of the sacrament, as has been acknowledged by older and strict doctrinarians, as John Gerhard and J. A. Bengel. After this, with entire correctness, he remarks,—where so different points of view lead to so different results, the question should not be decided without the most careful and extensive examination; and a decisive law should only be the result of such investigations, the expression of a well informed majority, which may be regarded as representing the ecclesiastical body of the realm. But the church of Denmark has nothing which can be viewed as representing the church or the clergy. The ecclesiastical *Collegium* is a court consisting of mere lawyers, who have only to judge whether and when it is proper to set forth theological opinions and replies, and how far they are to be complied with. But in the present case it is by no means true that every thing has been done to secure a certain and satisfactory decision. The personal rights of the subjects have not been properly regarded by that body. Neither has the opinion of the Theological Faculty been taken, which, in 1740, in a similar case, was asked first of all. On the question of requiring compulsory baptisms, only two clergymen were consulted; these expressed op-

posite opinions, and yet an arrangement was adopted of a one-sided character, according to the judgment of one of them. Neither one of them could properly be regarded as the index of the general sentiment. Those best qualified to speak were not heard, and the legal decision was made before the necessary premises were in the possession of those who made it. Such are the grave and energetic expressions of one who was not consulted on an ecclesiastical question so important. For the honor of the church of Denmark, we could wish that the author's closing words might prove true:—'We are confident that there will be no energetic advancement,—and least of all in the church,—without thoroughly considering what modifications can be introduced into the laws, or the application of them. This springs from our fixed conviction that the church of Denmark neither can nor ought to be regulated by the influences of party views.'

The present article, being mostly translated from a Review in the *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, exhibits not only the feelings entertained in Denmark towards the Baptists, but also the judgment of intelligent Germans in respect to the matter in controversy, and the measures pursued by the Danish government. We have not space to relate in detail the history and progress of the Baptist communities in that country. The facts can be learned from the Annual Reports of the American Baptist Missionary Board, and from the Baptist Missionary Magazine. Suffice it to say, that the Baptist churches in Denmark have enjoyed great spiritual prosperity, and large additions have been made to their members. Persecution has, also, been actively employed to arrest their progress. Münster, for example, has been five times thrown into prison; and, through the watchfulness of the police, many of the members have been repeatedly arrested, and several of them again and again imprisoned and fined. These measures of the government, however, serve only to draw public attention to those against whom they are directed. They awaken the interest, and, as we have seen, enlist the sympathies of enlightened men. They give rise to discussions among both the clergy and people, and we cannot doubt that they will ultimately hasten the prevalence in Denmark of just laws, an apostolic faith and practice, a liberal and wise policy, and unobstructed religious freedom.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY NOTICES.

1. *Die theologischen Lehren der Griechischen Denker. Eine Prüfung der Darstellung Cicero's* (The Theological Opinions of the Greek Philosophers; or an Examination of Cicero's account of them.) Von A. B. KRISCHE. Göttingen. 1840.

To the theologian and the metaphysician the treatise of Cicero on the Nature of the Gods is one of great historical interest. The reflections of such a pagan philosopher as Cicero on that subject, would of themselves be valuable as illustrating how much, and at the same time, how little, can be known of it without the aid of divine revelation. But Cicero, who had diligently studied the Greek philosophers, and rather reflected on their speculations than originated any system of his own, has spread before us the sentiments of the various schools of ancient philosophy. Particularly valuable is that part of the first book of the treatise in which the views of the principal philosophers of former times are rehearsed in the order of their succession.

Inasmuch as Plutarch, Eusebius and other Greek writers have given us similar summaries, and many fragments relating to the opinions of individual philosophers have descended to our times, it becomes at once an interesting and an important inquiry, how far the account of Cicero corresponds with what is found on the same subject in the remains of Greek literature. Krische has undertaken, with the usual industry of his countrymen, the investigation of this subject. The volume which contains the result of his inquiries, though complete in itself, is the first in a series of investigations which the author intends to make on several topics connected with ancient philosophy. That he is well qualified, by his extensive classical learning and by his philosophical habits, to do justice to his theme, is proved by every page of the work. His knowledge is both various and exact, enabling him not only to collect whatever is extant on each topic, but to assign to the particulars their proper place in the respective systems to which they belong. Entire success in such an undertaking is not to be expected. We know too little of the formation, progress and gradual modifications of these ancient systems of philosophy, to pronounce with absolute certainty upon every point. But whatever could be done by any one individual, appears to have been accomplished in the work before us. Did our space allow, it would be interesting to draw a parallel between the speculations of ancient and modern philosophers on this great subject of the nature of the Deity. The result would show, that from the time of Bacon to that of Hegel, little—if we except those modifications which Christianity has given to modern systems—has been thought or said on the subject which was not thought and said long before. It is hardly necessary to say, in conclusion, that

Krische has written only for those who have already made considerable attainments in classical learning and in the history of philosophy. We have been anxiously watching for the continuation of this work, but are not aware that a second volume has yet appeared.

2. *Die Lehre von den göttlichen Eigenschaften* (The Doctrine of the Divine Attributes) *dargestellt von I. F. BRUCH, Professor der Theologie in Strassburg. Hamburg. 1842.*

This work on the Attributes of God furnishes us the only information we have of the author. From it we learn that he is orthodox in his faith, and well informed on the subject of which he treats. The speculative pantheistic theories are subjected to a severe criticism in his introduction. The older as also more recent orthodox theologians are next examined with impartiality and philosophical power, and then the subject of the attributes themselves, in all their theological bearings, is treated with a thoroughness not inferior to that which distinguishes the works of Schluirmacher, Twesten and Nitzsch. Both in his method and in the results to which he comes, he is much safer and more satisfactory than Schleiermacher. The latter is too ingenuous and speculative; and in referring all the attributes to the idea of causation, and our knowledge of them to a pious feeling of dependence, is wholly arbitrary. Bruch approaches much nearer to Twesten, though he is bolder, and less mistifying and hair-splitting. There are a few things in his system which some would pronounce transcendental, as when he makes the divine existence a matter of consciousness. We must agree with him that the necessity of contemplating God under the form of attributes, does not lie in the divine nature in itself considered, but in the imperfection of our capacities; that an attribute, in its strict sense, is the nature of God under some particular manifestation to us, or sustaining a positive outward relation to us, and is therefore to be distinguished from mere modes of existence. Thus there is a formal, though not essential difference between God's nature and his attributes. Infinity is not an attribute; it is a mere mode of the divine existence; it is not capable of being manifested or of acting upon us, as the divine power, love—and the like. The treatment of the primary idea of God, the manner and conditions of his existence, is properly preliminary to that of the attributes, and should not be mingled with them. To the theologian, especially to the theological instructor, this work will form a valuable aid; for the ordinary reader it is too abstract and philosophical.

3. *Das Leben Johannes Ockolampads und die Reformation der Kirche zu Basel* (The Life of John Oecolampadius and the Reformation of the Church at Basle). *Beschrieben von JOHAN JAKOB HERZOG, Professor der Theologie zu Lausanne. In zwei Bände, pp. 366 und 307. Basel. 1843.*

Herzog has won an honorable place among the biographers of distinguished men in the church. As is indicated in the title, this work is particularly designed as a contribution to special church history. Nor will it disappoint the expectation thus raised. As a theologian, the author is well qualified to form a just estimate of the true nature and importance of those great questions in doctrine and worship which

agitated the minds of the men whose lives are described. With this theological element of the author's character is associated a decided taste and talent for history. He evidently came to his work with that inquisitiveness and enthusiasm which are indispensable to laborious historical investigations. The book itself bears internal marks of being not the fruit of literary leisure and quiet, but of sweat and toil.

A circumstance that adds much to the value of Herzog's labors is, that the historical society of Basle, have instituted innumerable special inquiries in regard to the early history both of the city and of the diocese of Basle, the results of which are to be found only among its transactions. These are, for the first time, collected, arranged, and, in a condensed form, published in the work before us. The first hundred pages, devoted to an account of the political, ecclesiastical, literary and social relations of Basle from the early part of the middle ages to the time of Luther, contain one of the most valuable and interesting historical essays which it has been our happiness to meet with for a long time. We are gratified to learn that it is in a course of translation in Scotland.

4. *The American Dictionary of the English Language*. First Edition in Octavo, containing the whole Vocabulary of the Quarto, with Corrections, Improvements, and several Thousand Additional Words. To which is prefixed an Introductory Dissertation on the Origin, History and Connection of the Languages of Western Asia and Europe. With an Explanation of the Principles on which Languages are formed. By NOAH WEBSTER, LL. D. 2 vols., Royal 8vo. pp. 938, 1020. Springfield G. H. Merriam. 1845.

Few employments are at the same time more laborious, thankless and useful, than the employment of the lexicographer. And very few men are adapted to excel in this department. It requires peculiar tastes, great discrimination, indefatigable perseverance, and an extensive and thorough acquaintance with languages. The fruits of tedious investigations are often sent forth in a single line; and the author performs a vast amount of perplexing and wearisome labor, for which he receives but little credit. The dictionary of any language should contain all the words belonging to the lawful usage of that language, whether spoken or written;—the dialect of common conversation, the terms of science, the elevated language of books, the words passing or passed into desuetude, but still occasionally to be met with, and the new forms invented, compounded or naturalized, being drawn by the best writers from foreign tongues, and suited to fill a chasm in the vocabulary. With the progress of civilization and refinement, science and art, a language is always gradually enriched. Foreign terms, clothed in their foreign garb, are not sufficient for the necessities of a people; if the foreign words are adopted, they must generally be adopted with a native dress. So chemistry, botany and geology have all, not only increased the circle of human knowledge, but have brought their tribute to the dictionary; they have each made up a parcel for the use of the language, and brought it with them, as a help to the necessities and a contribution to the stores of the tongue. But all this enlargement has necessarily increased the labor of the lexicographer.

In the infancy of a language, a man may make a dictionary with far less labor. He has few books, if any, to be consulted; no treasures of learning to be searched; no fields of literature to be travelled through; no sciences to be questioned; and few nice distinctions to be unravelled in the usage of terms. But in the progress of a language, the work of a lexicographer becomes more and more laborious. And after words have been accumulating for hundreds of years, he can never, with the labor of a life time, be sure that he has attained to a reasonable degree of perfection. He may, by accident, after all his toil, leave some mine of unexplored riches; or he may omit some common form of speech, which, from its very commonness, he is led to neglect. Were it not that every author is permitted to avail himself of the labors of his predecessors, so far as the catalogue of words is concerned, a complete dictionary, doubtless, would never be attained.

Another difficulty exists, especially in the advanced stage of a language, which makes the labor of a competent and thorough lexicographer no easy task. A complete dictionary, especially for the use of the learned scholar, ought to contain a history of the formation and changes of all the principal terms, if we may not say of every word. Children may be satisfied with obtaining the bare meaning of the word; but the man of discerning mind, the exact and polished writer, and the curious student of literature, are anxious, if a word is used in a peculiar sense, to know the character of the authority for such a usage; whether they are to be led by the caprice of an incompetent guide, or by a name of acknowledged weight in the world of letters. Hence the immense value of the work of Richardson. But the origin and formation of words is also a matter of great importance; and to many scholars, few studies have more attractions than the study of etymologies. A great number of words of the English language can be traced to the stock from which they came. Some have preserved their original form, nearly unchanged; some have been greatly altered, but the root, in a state of more or less perfect preservation, is still discoverable. A knowledge of the etymology of words is often a guide to the understanding of their precise signification; and without it, a thorough acquaintance with the powers of a language cannot be obtained. Hence a dictionary which omits the etymologies of terms, is, in one most important particular, defective. And the more extensive its tracing of them, the more fully does it answer, at least in one respect, the ends for which it was designed. But the further words are removed from their original sources, either as to time or force, the more difficult it is to discover their origin and affinities. We can more easily permit a man, however, to be fanciful in some of his derivations, than to pass them over altogether. And, in the transformations of language arising from refinement or philosophy, we can pardon a writer who makes occasional mistakes.

In most of the respects indicated in the preceding remarks, we are prepared to award a meed of unqualified praise to our great American lexicographer, whose work is before us. His introduction, extending to upwards of sixty pages, is very full, and, to the lovers of the study of language, highly interesting. It shows by numerous examples, the affinities of languages, the changes which words pass through in being transferred from one language to another, and the modifications of the

English language in successive periods. It cannot be read by any one without producing an impression of the extensive acquirements of the author, and the skill with which he directed his studies into departments best adapted to qualify him for his task. The dictionary itself is constructed in a manner answering most fully the ends for which such a work is designed. It is a work of immense labor, and generally very satisfactory in its results. The etymology and history which is given with most of the root words, renders the volumes a suitable and welcome companion to the student and the scholar. The extensive research, wide induction and patient industry manifested in every part of the work, and the philosophical discrimination exhibited in the significations of words, are suited to inspire confidence and to win for the great lexicographer sincere admiration and respect. The work leaves little to be desired in this department. The volumes are well printed on substantial paper and strongly and handsomely bound in sheep, with double lettering. They are an honor to our country, and we hope they will meet a wide circulation.

In the article *Dictionaries*, in the American Encyclopædia, we find it stated that the quarto edition of Webster's Dictionary published in New York (1828) and republished in London (1829), contains between 60,000 and 70,000 words. From an average calculation, we suppose the present edition to contain at least between 80,000 and 90,000. Indeed, the title page announces the addition of several thousand words which were not in the original edition, and several thousands more have been added as a supplement by Dr. Webster's executors.

ARTICLE IX.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.

The Baptist General Convention for Foreign Missions. The Thirty-second Annual Meeting of the Board, together with an adjourned meeting of the Triennial Convention, was held at Brooklyn, N. Y., on Tuesday, May 19, 1846. The receipts of the treasury for the financial year ending April 1, 1846, have been as follows: from donations and legacies \$100,219 94; American and Foreign Bible Society, \$7,000; American Tract Society, \$1,000; United States Government, \$4,400: the receipts include \$29,203 40 towards the payment of the debt of \$40,000, reported last year; and the sum necessary for its entire liquidation has been subscribed. The expenditures have been \$94,866 54. Of the Missionary Magazine there are circulated 5400 copies; of the Boston edition of the Macedonian, 14,000.

The number of missions under the direction of the Board is sixteen ; of these, five have been to the Indian tribes in North America ; three in Europe ; one in Africa, and seven in Asia. The tribes embraced in the missions among the Indians in North America are the Ojibwas, Ottawas, Tonawandas, Shawanoes and Cherokees. These missions comprise 20 stations and out-stations ; missionaries and assistants, 29 ; native preachers and assistants, 11 ; the number of churches is 12, with about 1300 members. 52 baptisms were reported the past year ; the number of schools is 9, with 180 pupils.

Among the Cherokees, six monthly numbers of the "Cherokee Messenger" have been published, 6000 copies 8vo., embodying a translation of the book of Genesis. Four hundred copies of each monthly issue are circulated. A greater proportion of the Cherokees can read than of whites. Such is the simplicity of the alphabet, that a Cherokee can learn to read the Messenger in three or four days. Every syllable in Cherokee ends with a vowel. A tract of 12 pages has also been published during the year. The Gospel of Luke is ready for the press.

In Shawanoe, the gospel of John has been printed. A portion of the Ottawas are connected with this mission. Schools are maintained at several different points.

The number of missions in Europe is 3 ; of stations and out-stations, 58 ; of missionaries and assistants, 8 ; of native preachers and assistants, 28 ; of churches, 24 ; of baptisms the last year, 264 ; of church members, about 1700. These missions are in France, Germany, Denmark, and the neighboring countries, and Greece.

In France, a spirit of religious inquiry is awakened ; the prospects of usefulness are more encouraging than formerly. In connection with the German mission, 6 new churches have been constituted, and others are about to be organized ; the reformation is extending in all directions ; the churches in Denmark increase in numbers and efficiency ; the cause advances in Holland. Bible and tract distribution is prosecuted with unremitting diligence. More than 7000 Bibles and Testaments have been circulated, and about 250,000 tracts, with other religious publications. The "Young Men's Union," of Hamburg, sends its laborers into all quarters. Persecution, though continued at some places, has generally abated.

At Corfu, in Greece, the mission school contains 70 pupils ; the attendance on Greek services is small, but on English is increasing. At Piræus, the prospect of usefulness is improving. A Bible class and Sabbath school are well attended, and by individuals distinguished for intelligence and respectability.

In West Africa, there are two stations and two out-stations, and two native assistants. The seat of the mission has been removed to Bexley. Schools have been taught there, and at Edina, and the out-stations; the gospel has been extensively preached at the stations and in the neighboring villages. Preparations have been made for printing Romans and Corinthians in Bassa, also a Bassa dictionary, &c.

The whole number of missions in Asia is 7; Maulmain, Tavoy, Arracan, Siam, China, Assam, and the Teloogoos; including stations and out-stations, 61; missionaries and assistants, 58; native assistants, 114; churches, 35; baptized 288; present number, about 2400; schools 40 or 50; pupils, 1600. (?)

With the Maulmain mission are connected eleven male missionaries from this country, besides females; also, 36 native preachers and assistants. The number of stations is 6, and of out-stations 11. There are 11 places of stated religious worship, and seven churches. The whole number of members, 711. There are 14 schools, including two for native preachers, and 467 pupils. 2800 volumes, or 311,100 pages have been printed, besides 40,000 pages in English. Pages printed from the beginning, 61,224,300. 17,296 books and tracts have been distributed. Portions of the New Testament and several tracts have been translated into Pgho Karen. A part have been printed. The Peguan Scriptures are about to be put to press. The way into Burmah Proper is re-opened.

At Tavoy, the number of churches connected with the mission, (as reported in 1844-5) is 14, and of members about 800. The schools have been reduced in numbers by sickness. The seminary for native preachers had 11 pupils. The printing in Tavoy amounted in 1845 to 287,024 pp., and the issues to 312,822 pp.

In Siam, 6740 copies of Siamese books, including part of the second edition of the New Testament, have been printed, or 442,200 pp. 8vo.; and 2512 copies in Chinese—110,284 pp. 8vo. A font of Siamese type has been cut and forwarded to Maulmain, and another for Prince Chau-fayai.

In China, the members of the Canton department of the mission removed to Canton April 1, 1845. A church was immediately organized, containing 24 members. The Hongkong church was left in charge of native assistants. Six were added to it by baptism in April, making their number 17. Dr. Macgowan proceeded to Ningpo about the first of April. The dispensary connected with the station has been numerously frequented, and the opportunities which it has afforded for giving religious instruction, have been diligently improved.

The New Testament, in Assamese, is nearly ready for the press, and parts of it have been printed; also an Assamese hymn book, tracts, school books, &c.

The whole number of missions in connection with the Board, as stated in the Report, is 16; stations and out-stations, 143; missionaries and assistants, of whom 42 are preachers, 99; native preachers and assistants, 155; churches, 82; members of churches, 5373; baptized the past year, 604; schools, 54; pupils, about 2000.

A Remedial Act having been procured from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, authorizing a change of name of the General Convention, and an Act of Incorporation from the Legislature of Massachusetts for the AMERICAN BAPTIST MISSIONARY UNION, this Society held its first meeting on Thursday, May 21. A preliminary meeting was held in New York, in November, 1845, at which a Constitution was adopted, and a Board of Managers elected. The principal features of the new organization are the following:—The Union is composed of life members, including those members of the Baptist General Convention who were present at the meeting at which the Constitution was adopted, and other persons, paying at one time one hundred dollars. The Board of Managers consists of seventy-five persons, at least one third of whom must be laymen. The Board is to be elected in three equal classes, the first to go out of office at the first annual meeting of the Union; and thus, in regular succession, one third of the Board goes out of office at each annual meeting, and their places are to be supplied by a new election. In every case, the members whose term of service shall thus expire, are reëligible.

The Board of Managers elect, at their annual meeting, a Sub-Board, styled the Executive Committee, consisting of nine members, of whom not more than five are to be ministers of the gospel; to whom the entire responsibility of conducting the missions of the Board is entrusted. The Corresponding Secretaries and Treasurer, are not to be members of the Executive Committee. The meetings of the Union are to be annual.

The President, Vice Presidents, and Recording Secretary of the Union, the members of the Board of Managers, the Executive Committee, the Corresponding Secretaries, the Treasurer, the Auditing Committee, and all missionaries employed by the Executive Committee, shall be members in good standing of regular Baptist churches.

Under this Constitution, the American Baptist Missionary Union numbers 543 life members, of whom 50 are females. The members reside as follows:—in Maine 24; in New Hampshire 6; in Vermont 8; in Massachusetts 125; in Rhode Island 23; in Con-

necticut 27 ; in New York 145 ; in New Jersey 12 ; in Pennsylvania 96 ; in Delaware 4 ; in Maryland 1 ; in Kentucky 1 ; in Georgia 2 ; in Dist. of Columbia 1 ; in Ohio 5 ; in Michigan 2 ; in Illinois 1 ; in Missouri 1 ; in Wisconsin 1 ; in Burmah 9 ; in Siam 2 ; in China 7 ; in Assam 4 ; in Madras 1 ; Greece 1. 198 are ministers of the gospel ; 295 are laymen.

The American Baptist Home Mission Society held its fourteenth anniversary at Brooklyn, N. Y., May 13, 1846.

By the Treasurer's report, it appears that the receipts of the year ending April 1st, 1846, were \$16,228,00, being \$2,447,68 less than the receipts of the preceding year. Receipts of auxiliaries, \$24,360,10, being \$6,265,11 less than the preceding year ; the auxiliaries are three less in number than formerly. The whole sum received, immediately and through auxiliaries, is \$40,588,10. Last year, \$49,300,89. At the same date the resources of the Society, immediately available, were \$4,611,11, and the liabilities \$9,516,93, making the balance against the Society \$4,905,82. That balance may be provided for by the disposal of stocks, and other property, in the hands of the Treasurer, though, at present, the interests of the Society would render their sale undesirable.

One hundred and six missionaries and agents have labored under the commission of the Society, thirty-seven of whom have been re-appointed for another year ; they have occupied the same States and Territories as heretofore, with the addition of New Hampshire and Oregon ; they statedly supplied 472 stations ; and as the aggregate of their united labors, the amount of time bestowed by them is equal to that of one man for seventy-one years. They report the baptism of 992 persons ; the organization of thirty-three churches ; the ordination of fifteen ministers ; the completion, by their people, of twenty-eight houses of worship, and the commencement of thirteen ; and that eight churches, heretofore aided by the Society, have become able to support the gospel without further aid. The auxiliaries of the Society report the employment of 241 missionaries and agents, who have jointly performed 134 years of labor, supplied 640 stations, and baptized 669 persons. Six churches among them need no further missionary aid. The aggregate of these labors and results are 347 missionaries ; 205 years' labor performed ; 1691 persons baptized ; and fourteen churches heretofore aided, enabled to support the gospel independently of missionary funds. By adding to the statistics of the past year, those of previous years, as far as ascertained, it appears that since the formation of the Society, its missionaries have, jointly, performed 870 years' labor ;

baptized 15,416 persons ; organized 564 churches, and ordained 230 ministers.

The present number of life directors is 199 ; of life members, 876. During the last year, twenty-three names were added to the list of life directors, by the payment of one hundred dollars, and ninety-eight to that of life members, by the payment of thirty dollars. Contributions are acknowledged from all the New England States, except Maine ; from all the Middle States, except Delaware ; from all the Southern States, except Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas ; from all the Western States, except Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri ; from all the Territories, except Arkansas, Florida, and Oregon. Most of those States and Territories, however, embrace life members of the Society. The smallest donation reported from any State contributing to the funds, is from Indiana, \$8,10 ; the largest, from New York, \$6,520,49. More than half of the entire receipts of the Society for the year came from the Middle States.

The American and Foreign Bible Society held its ninth anniversary at the same place, May 14. The receipts the last year, ending May 1, including a small balance on hand at the commencement, were \$36,971,76 ; expenses, \$28,525,51 ; leaving a balance of \$8,446,25. Of the amount received, \$7,694,79 were for Scriptures sold, and \$24,509,62 were donations to the Society. There have been issued from the Depository during the year, 10,413 Bibles, 25,314 Testaments ; total 35,727.

The whole number of volumes published by the Society at its Depository since the commencement of the year, is 24,438, making the whole number published for home distribution, 167,119.

The foreign appropriations since the last report amount to \$12,250, viz. :—To the Bible Translation Society, \$4,500 ; to the Board of the Triennial Convention, \$3,600 ; to the China Baptist Mission, \$2,000 ; to the German Baptist Mission, \$1,000 ; to the General Baptist Missionary Society, 1,000 ; to the Free Missionary Society, \$100 ; to the Honduras Baptist Mission, \$50.

The number of life members added during the year is 316, which, with those of previous years, makes the whole number 1920. Life directors added, 26—whole number 289.

American Baptist Publication Society.—The annual meeting was held at Philadelphia, April 28, 1846. There have been received during the last year, for the purposes of the Society, \$22,727 96. Legacies have been received amounting to \$3,000. The estimated

value of the Society's property on hand, consisting of stereotype plates, books and tracts, is \$16,718 09. The capital of the Society has increased during the year \$4,176 60. The most important publication of the Society is the "Complete Works of Andrew Fuller," in three 8vo. volumes, price \$7 50. The Society have also printed 5000 copies of the "Psalmist," 17,000 of the "Almanac and Baptist Register," a volume on the "Deaconship," by Dr. Howell, and three other new works, besides revising and stereotyping some of their former publications, and issuing new editions of others. Fifty thousand volumes have been put in circulation during the year. A project was set on foot at the annual meeting to raise a fund of \$10,000, the interest of which is to be annually expended in furnishing destitute Sabbath schools and clergymen in the West with the publications of the Society; one fifth of the sum was subscribed on that occasion.

The Southern Baptist Convention held its first annual meeting at Richmond, Va., June 11, 1846. The number of delegates present was 132; of whom 37—more than one half—were from Virginia. The financial concerns were reported to be as follows: amount received since the formation of the Convention, \$11,735; expenditures, \$2,231; balance in treasury, \$9,504, besides 5 shares of bank stock. From Georgia, \$1,920; Virginia, \$3,700; South Carolina, \$2,660; Alabama, \$2,441; Mississippi, \$283; North Carolina, \$251; Kentucky, \$392; Louisiana, \$5. Home Mission finance receipts, \$13,193; expended by local societies, \$8,460. Six missionaries have been employed by the Board, and \$1,100 expended by the Society proper. The Southern Convention engages both in Foreign and Domestic Missions—a Committee on each being appointed at the annual meeting. The Foreign Committee have missions in China and Africa. To missionaries have been sent to China since the meeting of the Convention. The Domestic Board have employed six missionaries, the last year. The Convention have commenced the publication, at Richmond, of the *Southern Baptist Missionary Journal*,—a periodical devoted to the interests both of domestic and foreign missions.

The seat of the Foreign Board is at Richmond, Va., of the Home Board at Marion, Ala.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICA.

William D. Ticknor & Company announce as in press *Alderbrook*, a collection of Fanny Forester's Village Tales, Poems, &c., by Miss Emily Chubbuck, with a fine portrait of the authoress from an engraving by Sartain.

L. Colby & Co., New York, have in press a work on China, by Rev. William Dean, American missionary, the manuscript of which he placed in the hands of the publisher before his recent return to the field of his labors. His long residence in that country, and his familiarity with the language and customs of the people, ensure the prospect of a very complete and interesting work.

Gould, Kendall & Lincoln are about to publish a Memoir of Mrs. Henrietta L. Shuck, missionary to China, by Rev. J. B. Jeter, of Richmond, Va. They have also in press the Memoir of Roger Williams, by Prof. Wm. Gammell, of Providence, R. I.

QUARTERLY LIST.

DEATHS.

R. J. ELLIOTT, Louisville, Ky., April 19.
 THOMAS S. GRIFFITHS, West Chester, Pa., May 16.
 SHUBAEL LOVELL, Bridgewater, Mass. June 8, aged 76.
 ISAAC McCoy, Louisville, Ky. June 21.
 SAMUEL WILSON, Cincinnati, O., April 29.

ORDINATIONS.

JOHN S. BEECHER, Hinesburgh, Vt., June 11.
 J. C. BURROUGHS, Waterford, N. Y., June 3.
 ANDREW BURNS, Savannah, Ashland Co., O., May 21.
 SAMUEL C. CLOPTON, Richmond, Va., June 11.
 DANIEL CUMMING, Baltimore, Md., June 21.
 PETER C. DAYFOOT, Medina, Orleans Co., N. Y., June 17.
 J. W. DENNISON, Cincinnati, O., June 17.
 ROBERT DUNCAN, jr., Spring Creek, Miami Co., O., May 5.
 WILLIAM L. GASKINS, Moratico, Lancaster Co., Va., May 31.
 STILLMAN B. GRANT, Granville, Wash. Co., N. Y., June 25.
 KING S. HALL, Hopkinton, N. H., April 22.
 ERASMUS N. JENKS, Hartford, Conn., June 10.
 REUBEN JONES, Edwards, St. Law. Co., N. Y., June 17.
 GEORGE MITCHELL, East Fallowfield, Chester Co., Pa., April 8.
 JOSEPH B. MITCHELL, Bethel, Me., May 27.
 CHRISTIAN J. PAGE, Milestown, Pa., March 5.
 WHELOCK H. PARMLY, Clinton, La., April 30.
 GEORGE W. PENDLETON, Stafford, Conn., June 14.
 W. RONEY, Hamilton, O., April 16.

L. Ross, New Bethel, O.
 LEWIS F. STELLE, Piscataway, N. J., May 28.
 J. B. STITELER, Philadelphia, Pa., June 9.

CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

Mount Fork, Hanover, Va., Jan. 22.
 French Township, Adams Co., Ind., March 21.
 Mt. Pulaski, Logan Co., Ill., March 28.
 Waynesborough, Ga., March 29.
 St. Andrews Bay, Florida, March.
 Dumansville, Huntingdon Co., Pa., April 8.
 State St. Chh., Albany, N. Y., April 14.
 Hamilton, O., April 15.
 Washington, Whitley Co., Ind., April 18.
 Washington Co., Va., April 20.
 Kirtland, Lake Co., O., April 28.
 Jamesville, Saratoga Co., N. Y., April 30.
 Olive Branch, Prince George Co., Va., April 30.
 Mt. Gilead, Marion Co., O., May 6.
 Monoquet, Kosciusko Co., Ind., May 7.
 Martinsburg, Knox Co., O., May 14.
 Ithica, Darke Co., O., May 16.
 Central Chh., Thompson, Conn., May 20.
 East Thompson, Conn., May 20.
 Carrollton, Ala., May 24.
 Huntington Chapel, Baltimore, Md., May.
 Haverstraw, N. J., June 4.
 Edmeston Centre, Otsego Co., N. Y., June 11.
 Newburyport, Mass., 2d Chh., June 16.

DEDICATIONS.

Hamilton, O., April 15.
 Reading, Pa., May 26.
 Williamson, Wayne Co., N. Y., May 26.
 Patterson, N. J., May 31.
 Buffalo, June 1.
 North Stonington, Conn., June 4.
 Petersburg, Va., June 7.
 Walnut Grove, Hanover, Va., June 14.